DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 394 UD 022 324

AUTHOR Cioffi, Michael R.
TITLE Professional and Lay Group Perceptions of Advisory Council Participation in Decision-Making in New York City Public Schools.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 265p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, Fordham University. Tables marginally legible.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; *Community Involvement; Community Leaders; Decentralization; *Decision Making; Educational Administration; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Programs; Money Management; *Parent Participation; Parents; *Parent School Relationship; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; *Role Perception; State Legislation; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; New York City Board of Education; *Parent Advisory Councils

ABSTRACT

This study examines and compares the perceptions of educational professionals and non-professional personnel concerning Parent Advisory Council members' degree of participatory decision making in the administration of Title I programs in New York City. The sample of educational professionals consisted of New York City district superintendents, principals, and teachers of Title I schools, while the non-professional sample consisted of Parent Advisory Council members, community school-based chairpersons, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards in New York City schools. Subjects were asked to indicate on a rating scale what they perceived to be the extent of council members' participation in Title I programs relative to: 1) educational needs assessment; 2) project selection; 3) collaborative planning; 4) financial management of reimbursables; and 5) program implementation and evaluation. The findings indicated that: 1) of the five decision-making areas considered, financial management of reimbursables was perceived by both groups to be the area in which there was the least participation; 2) there were no significant differences between the two groups in perceiving decision-making activities; and 3) no relationships were found between the subjects' ratings and the variables of age, sex, and length of experience in educational decision making. (Author/MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218394

PROFESSIONAL AND LAY GROUP PERCEPTIONS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING IN NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael R. Cioffi
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

by

MICHAEL R. CIOFFI

B.A., Brooklyn College
M.A., New York University
P.D., New York University

DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION OF
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK
1982

UD 022 324

Copyright 1983

By

Michael R. Cioffi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM	1
	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	8
	THEORETICAL RATIONALE	11
	DEFINITION OF TERMS	26
	SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	43
	LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	49
	ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY	51
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	53
	RELATED LITERATURE REGARDING PARENTAL PARTICIPATION IN THE SCHOOLS	53
	RELATED LITERATURE REGARDING ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS	75
	RELATED LITERATURE REGARDING ATTITUDES OF EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONALS AND NON-PROFESSIONALS CONCERNING THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS	88
	SUMMARY	94
III.	THE SUBJECTS, THE MATERIALS, AND THE PROCEDURES	97
	THE SUBJECTS	97
	THE MATERIALS	100
	THE PROCEDURES	100
	DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROBLEM	101
	DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT	101

CHAPTER		PAGE
	PANEL OF EXPERTS	105
	PILOT STUDY	109
	COLLECTION OF THE DATA	110
	STATISTICAL PROCEDURES	112
IV.	THE FINDINGS	118
	DISTRIBUTIONS OF THE RESPONSES OF PERSONNEL WITH REGARD TO PARTICIPATION OF DISTRICT PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS IN DECISION-MAKING OF TITLE I E.S.E.A. PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS	119
	COMPARISONS AMONG AND BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONALS AND NON-PROFESSIONALS REGARDING PARTICIPATION OF ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBER ACTIVITIES	124
	RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONALS' RESPONSES REGARDING PARTICIPATION OF COUNCIL MEMBERS IN TITLE I AND AGE, SEX, AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATIONAL DECISION-MAKING	126
	RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN NON-PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL RESPONSES REGARDING PARTICIPATION OF COUNCIL MEMBERS IN TITLE I AND AGE, SEX, AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATIONAL DECISION-MAKING	127
V.	THE SUMMARY, THE CONCLUSIONS, AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS	129
	THE SUMMARY	129
	Purpose of the Study	129
	Design of the Study	132
	Findings of the Study	135
	THE CONCLUSIONS	136

PAGE

THE RECOMMENDATIONS 138

BIBLIOGRAPHY 144

APPENDICES

A. INSTRUMENTS 165

B. PANEL OF EXPERTS 204

C. PANEL OF EXPERTS' EVALUATION FORMS 206

D. SAMPLE OF LETTERS 214

E. TABLES 227

ABSTRACT 247

VITA 249

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Identification of Activities and Items Concerning the Degree of Participation of District Parent Advisory Council Members in the Decision-Making Process of Title I Programs and Projects	228
II.	Distribution of Responses of Educational Professionals and Non-Professional Personnel Regarding the Degree of Participation of Advisory Council Members in the Decision-Making Process of Title I	233
III.	The t Tests of the Differences of the Means Between Professional and Non-Professional Members of Advisory Councils in Five Decision-Making Activities	242
IV.	Comparisons Among Rating Scale Dimensions for Educational Professionals and Non-Professional Personnel	244
V.	Relationships Between Educational Professionals' Responses Regarding Participation of Council Members in Title I and Age, Sex, and Years of Experience in Educational Decision-Making	245
VI.	Relationships Between Non-Professional Personnel Regarding Participation of Council Members in Title I and Age, Sex, and Years of Experience in Educational Decision-Making	246

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

In the 1960's, urban parents began making demands for a school system which was responsible to them and to their children. They wanted to build a new and relevant system accountable to them alone (Fantini, 1969). The feeling among community persons was that the administrative organization of the New York City central board of education generally isolated itself from the members of the greater community (Gittell, 1967). Gordon (1970) indicated that parents and community persons often regarded the schools with cynicism and fear, and felt that they were incapable of making effective changes in the school program. Local, university based, and federal programs, however, which included Parent-Child Centers, Head Start, and Follow Through gave rise to several promising approaches to parental involvement in the schools during the 1960's.

Title I (1965) was the largest segment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (hereinafter abbreviated E.S.E.A.). Title I in Ohio indicated that Title I was a federally funded compensatory program for educationally disadvantaged children living in areas with high concentrations of low-income families. The

legislation directed that priority educational needs of children in qualified attendance areas be identified and local programs designed to provide appropriate supplemental instruction.

Moreover, Stonhill et al. (1979) also declared that:

> the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (E.S.E.A.) in 1965 was a landmark in that it was the first to piece of federal education legislation to provide substantial funds for categorial programs in compensatory education, as well as being the first example of major educational legislation which contained a provision for periodic evaluation (p. 3).

One of the important outcomes of E.S.E.A. was the direct involvement of parents and local citizens in Title I programs and projects. In 1970, Public Law 91-230 called for the participation of parents and school-related target area residents in E.S.E.A. Title I programs and projects, and required local school districts to establish direct parent advisory councils. The Education Amendments of 1974, moreover, required school units to organize advisory councils as well.

The New York City Board of Education Circular (1971) entitled "Guidelines for Advisory Councils" indicated that:

> ...(in order) to ensure parental and community involvement as a means of increasing the effectiveness of all reimbursable programs, the federal guidelines for E.S.E.A. Title I (1965) were being applied to all funded programs supported by grants

from foundations and other private sources... (p. 1).

Moreover, the New York City Board of Education Circular (1971) guidelines established parent advisory councils "for coordinating the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs using Urban Education, Title I, and other special funds for compensatory programs..." (p. 1).

The New York State Education Law Chapter 330, Article 52-A (1969) made it possible for local community members to participate in educational decision-making. The law specifically instituted 33 autonomous community school districts and required every school to establish a parent organization which would allow parents to participate more directly in the decision-making process.

In the 1970's, parents and community groups became more actively involved in educational decision-making under decentralization (President's Manual for Parent Associations, 1973). The Central Board of Education policy statement entitled Parent Associations and The Schools (Office of Educational Information Services, 1971) emphasized the relationship between decentralization and decision-making; that the purpose of decentralization was to afford parents and community groups opportunities for participation in decision-making. Parents and community members according to Vidal (1976),

Boutwell (1975), and Fantini and Gittell (1970) had brought about a more responsive school system as a result of their decision-making power. Martin (1974) found that parent advisory councils identified community leaders, acquainted the school staff with the community, and were essential links between the school and the community.

The National Urban League (1971), Boutwell (1969), and Riles (1968) all agreed upon the importance of parental participation in Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects, and in the disbursement of Title I funds. The National Urban League (1971) called the E.S.E.A. perhaps the most significant law providing Federal funds to local school systems for special educational programs, where parents made proposals, planned the program, wrote the budgets, and evaluated the programs. Riles (1968), moreover, affirmed that Title I local advisory committees would give the parents of the poor and educationally disadvantaged an opportunity to become increasingly involved in compensatory education projects.

Decentralization encouraged parents to become involved in the decision-making process whereby they might be offered opportunities to express their ideas freely (Morphet, 1974; Cunningham, 1971; and White, 1968). Community control provided the means for community members to share in decisions affecting their youngsters

and compelled educators to be accountable to the public they served (Manning, 1969).

Hubbard (1970) conceived of decentralization as covering "the spectrum from administrative decentralization to turning real power over to local boards" (p. 2). Gittell (1971) felt "that school decentralization was a populist movement, leading educators and an urban public, largely poor, to reform the schools. School decentralization was regarded as a necessary reform, if not a panacea" (p. 3). Orenstein (1973) stated that decentralization had been brought about with some kind of community participation in most school systems serving 50,000 or more students. Ravitch et al. (1975) stated that "decentralization in New York City has created new job opportunities for minorities and brought control of schools closer to the community" (p. 1). According to Long (1977), 'decentralized decision-making' had been "interpreted broadly to mean greater involvement of parents and school building staff in certain decisions that affect the delivery of educational services to the children..." (p. 3).

Evans (1977) believed that decentralization meant:

> delegating powers of decision-making to bodies other than those which remain mere agents of central authority. Decentralization thus transfers a real decision-making role to autonomous institutions at regional or local levels" (p. 32).

Mallory and Cotton (1977) stated that decentralization...

> is an administrative procedure that attempts to set up a middle-level of accountability so that local citizens can have easier access to policy-makers and a greater voice in decision-making concerning their schools (p. 4).

Davies et al. (1978) suggested that:

> the major response to the community control idea was administrative decentralization. Specifically, decentralization was the legislative reaction to the community control conflict in both New York City and Detroit. These cities were and remain the only examples of political decentralization where some power devolved to community school boards and where participation by parents and other citizens is built into the plan (p. 34).

Pierce (1980) designed a plan whereby the school replaced the central district office as the basic unit of educational management. He suggested that school based management:

> is an educational reform designed to improve public education through decentralization. Its adoption involves moving many decisions regarding school budgets, personnel, and curricula from the central district office to the school building (p. 6).

Hagood (1969) felt that:

> community control of schools represents a golden opportunity for central administrators, principals, parents, communities, students, teachers, and teachers' unions to come together and develop a new educational structure and process for the benefit of the children and all others involved (p. 6).

Etzioni (1969) and Berule (1971) believed that, in order for schools to meet the comprehensive social needs of the communities, increased parent participation in

decision-making was essential. Gittell (1972) stated that, as a result of community action programs, community participation and concern over local problems were significantly broadened and increased.

Zeigler et al. (1973) believed that:

> the community control movement has attempted to give parents more decision-making power. However, community participation was made an integral part of the O.E.O. programs and the Model Cities program (p. 10).

Task Force (1974), a national task force for high school reform, made several recommendations for solving the most pressing problems in the schools. The most important recommendation was that consumers and lay persons were to become more deeply involved in school governance, and that local citizens and the community expand their political participation in education.

Mallory and Cotton (1977) suggested that:

> advocates of an expanded role for schools point to the universality of public education, the presence of physical and human resources, established funding mechanisms, and local control as the advantages of a school-based delivery system (p. 13).

Davies (1978) indicated that:

> citizen participation can lead to institutional policies which are more responsive to the needs of the constituents and communities served. Citizen participation will contribute to developing school policies and practices which are more effective and equitable than institutionally developed ones... (pp. 11-12).

Few in-depth studies have been completed

regarding district parent advisory councils and Title I programs and projects in New York City. This study was an attempt to ascertain district parent advisory council participation in decision-making as perceived by professional school groups and lay community groups in New York City Public Schools in five decision-making activities which include: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The primary purpose of this study was to determine and compare the degree of participation of district advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects relative to: (1) educational needs; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation as perceived by educational professionals which included district superintendents, principals of Title I schools and teachers of Title I pupils in comparison with non-professional personnel which were made up of district parent advisory council members, community school board chairpersons, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons

of community planning boards in seven school districts of New York City elementary schools, intermediate schools, and junior high schools in the Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn. The District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale was the instrument designed by the researcher and utilized in collecting the data for the study.

Moreover, this study sought to determine whether significant relationships existed between the perceptions of educational professionals and non-professional personnel in seven school districts of selected New York City elementary schools, intermediate schools, and junior high schools in the Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn with regard to the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects, and each of the variables of age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making. Specifically, this study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What were the distributions of the responses of educational professionals in comparison with non-professional personnel with regard to the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects in the following decision-making

activities: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation?

2. Did significant differences exist between the means of the responses of educational professionals relative to the five decision-making activities? The question of interest here concerned whether or not educational professionals rated decision-making dimensions equally with respect to the degree of participation of district parent advisory councils.

3. Did significant differences exist between the means of the responses of non-professional personnel relative to the five decision-making activities? The question of interest here concerned whether or not non-professional personnel rated decision-making dimensions equally with respect to the degree of participation of district parent advisory councils.

4. Did significant differences exist between the means of the responses of educational professionals and non-professional personnel with respect to the five decision-making activities?

5. Did significant relationships exist between the responses of educational professionals and the responses of non-professional personnel with regard to the

degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects relative to the five decision-making activities: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation and each of the variables of age, sex and years of experience in educational decision-making?

Did significant relationships exist between the responses of non-professional personnel with regard to the degree of participation in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects relative to the five decision-making activities and the variables of age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making?

THEORETICAL RATIONALE

The theoretical rationale for this study incorporated three theory bases. The theoretical rationale included the concepts of the politics of Urban America regarding citizen participation in decision-making in a democracy, decision-making theory, and organizational structure theory.

Dahl (1967) indicated that political power in the United States was pluralistic, and that the fundamental theory of American pluralism included multiple centers of power. Dye and Ziegler (1978) defined pluralism as:

> the belief that democratic values can be preserved in

> a system of multiple, competing elites who determine public policy through a process of bargaining and compromise, in which voters exercise meaningful choices in elections and new elites can gain access to power (p. 10).

Kelso (1978) felt that public pluralism was:

"primarily a set of prescriptive principles for regulating the interplay of interest groups and agencies (p. 29).

Moreover, he maintained that public pluralism:

> (1) assists the formation of neighborhood organizations, especially among residents of the ghetto; (2) tolerates the development of multiple government units with varying jurisdictions and responsibilities; (3) arranges the above units of government in an overlapping, federated fashion so that the ability of communities to isolate themselves from neighboring communities would be limited; and (4) provides some government body with the power to review and veto the actions of smaller government authorities (p. 234).

Dye (1979) defined pluralism as:

> an integrated body of theory that seeks to reaffirm the fundamental democratic character of American society... pluralism developed as an ideology designed to reconcile the ideals of democracy with the realities of a large-scale, industrial, technocratic society (pp. 9-10).

Rose (1967) advanced the multi-influence hypothesis of society. He understood society as being made up of many elites, each relatively small and operating in distinct spheres of life. He further stated that several elites derived power through political controls, while other elites derived power through associational, religious, military, and other types of control.

Nicholls (1975) believed that a pluralistic system of government enabled large numbers of interest groups to come into existence to achieve some specific aim or purpose.

Moreover, he felt that an interest group was viewed as utilizing its influence in persuading the government to perform an essential good which would be beneficial to that particular group.

According to Riesman (1950), power in America was wielded by so-called veto groups. These consisted of labor and professional groups, major ethnic and regional groups, various business groups, farm groups and movie-censoring groups. Dye and Ziegler (1978) confirmed Riesman's conclusions and stated that..."multiple elites decide public policy in America, each in their own area of interest" (p. 11).

Several sociologists closured the power bases within a polyarchy or representative democracy. Hunter (1953) and Mills (1956) indicated that the power structure in America consisted of the political, economic, and military sectors of society and was dominated by the economic elite which was ascendant over the political elite. The economic elite attempted to control the political processes in America. Hunter (1953) further indicated that the businessman's class organized cliques or crowds which formulated policy. Moreover, Mills (1956) suggested that corporate executives were closely associated with important politicians who made up the political directorate of the government of the United States.

Kornhauser (1959) believed that the major

guarantee against the concentration of power in American society by elites was "the existence of a plurality of groups that are equal enough in power to generate genuine competition for leadership on the several levels of political society" (p. 236). Dahl (1961) in his study indicated that key decisions in America were made by a number of distinct groups within the society. Iannaccone (1970) suggested that the presence of a number of elites with distinct power bases and the absence of a single elite made possible the establishment of an open system. He further added that an open pluralist system made provision for diversity, shielded groups from attack, and made possible opportunities for the organization of action. Nicholls (1975) added that pluralism ensured the distribution of power throughout the community and that governmental policy could not be determined by a single group or a single people.

Mills (1956) generally considered the majority of the people in American society as a passive, powerless, undifferentiated class. Rose (1967) on the other hand, maintained that the bulk of the population consisted not of the mass but of integrated groups and publics with various degrees of power and that these publics were more differentiated and far less susceptible to control by a single elite.

Dahl (1970) realized that political equality could more fully be realized in smaller combinations or associations. He concluded that citizens would perhaps be given better opportunities for making decisions if they participated more fully in units smaller than nation, state or megalopolis. He proposed neighborhoods and cities of human proportions so as to equalize and provide greater citizen participation in the process of decision-making.

Crenson (1971) stated that:

> the pluralist organization of the political elite,... helps to assure that the great bulk of the population will enjoy a substantial amount of indirect influence in the making of almost all public decisions, even though it seldom participates directly in the making of any public decision (p. 179).

Gamson (1975) supported pluralism and characterized it:

> by its ability to handle multiple problems simultaneously--the prevention of dominance by a single group or individual, responsiveness to the needs of its citizens, and the prevention of extreme or violent conflict (p. 6).

Dye and Zeigler (1978) indicated that popular participation in the decision-making process had been valued as an opportunity for the self-development of the individual in traditional democratic theory. Moreover, they suggested that:

> self-development means self-government, and self-government can be accomplished only by encouraging each individual to contribute to the development of

> public policy and by resolving conflicts over public policy through majority rule (p. 7).

Tichenor (1980) agreed with the findings of Gamson (1975). Tichenor (1980) and Gamson (1975) found that elites were in competition for the allocation of valued resources in pluralistic communities. Moreover, Tichenor (1980) suggested that pluralistic communities

> offer many opportunities for satisfying economic needs, for socializing, for learning and personal development, for religious experience, for altruism and helping others, for being entertained, and for the array of other values people express (p. 7).

Decision-making theory has been frequently used by educational theorists as a conceptual framework for explaining how decisions were made within a social system. Litchfield (1956) viewed administration as a cycle of activities which began and ended in decision-making. Bennis (1969) theorized that decision-making was dependent upon the ability to make choices, to generate alternatives, to tolerate ambiguities, and to utilize resources in the environment as an organization responds to change. Easton (1973) stated that "the term, decision, is used in two ways: to indicate a complex process, and synonymously with the word, choice" (p. 84). Hastings and Mello (1978) defined the term 'decision' as "choosing an action" (p. 4).

Stufflebeam et al. (1971) identified four major stages of decision-making: (a) the awareness stage; (b) the design stage; (c) the choice stage; and (d) the action

stage. Litterer (1973) also suggested three fundamental decision-making components:

> (1) establishing limited individual or group objectives; (2) arranging the information individuals receive for decision-making through scheduling and uncertainty absorption, and (3) providing rules or programs to be used in decision-making (pp. 79-80).

Paine and Naumes (1975) indicated that decision theory consisted of two components; the normative and the descriptive. Normative decision theory was essentially "the theory of rational choice in complex situations" (p. 18). Descriptive decision theory was primarily "behavior oriented" (p. 19).

Weiland and Ullrich (1976) described the decision-making process as comprising "the identification phase which comprises recognition that strategic action is required, and a diagnosis of the situation in which action is to occur" (p. 422). Kurfman (1977) identified the decision-making process as a series of cognitive acts beginning with the identification of the need for a decision and ending with the reflection on the products of the decision-making process. Radford (1978) stated that the decision-making process has been thought of as consisting of three broad phases: "(1) intelligence--the search for conditions calling for a decision; (2) design--the formulation of appropriate courses of action; and (3) choice--the selection from among available courses

of action" (p. 75).

Kast and Rosenzweig (1979) suggested that:

> an integral element of the managerial task is organizational decision-making--choosing an overall strategy, setting specific objectives, designing structures and processes, selecting people, delegating responsibility, evaluating results, and initiating changes (p. 344).

Hart (1980) suggested that leaders needed to know that decision-making required "a knowledge of the total organization, the people involved, the time restraints, and the complexity of the problem" (p. 143).

Rossi (1957) indicated that decision-making might also be made by community members. He maintained that a community decision was made by "a group within the community institutions and of which the goals are the change or maintenance of community-wide institutions or facilities" (p. 417). Sayler (1971), Owens (1970), and Dill (1964) found that group participation in decision-making produced certain advantages over individual decision-making. Group participation resulted in more cooperation in implementing choices among alternatives and produced better quality decisions. Programs involving parents produced closer relationships between teachers and parents, parents and children, principals and the community. Cook and Morgan (1971) and Green and Levinson (1970) felt that broader participation was necessary to involve unorganized publics into the administrative, legislative, and judicial process

of government as decision-makers. Maple (1977) indicated that shared decision-making encouraged:

> (1) communication between partners who each have clear responsibilities, as opposed to an up-to-down communication process between a superior and a subordinate; (2) goal focused content with time and energy saved for action planning; and (3) two alternatives including seeking choices to change behaviors, and seeking causes of behavior (p. 8).

The scientific framework for the decision-making process was conceptualized by Griffiths (1959) as consisting of six definitive procedures: (1) recognize, define and limit the problem; (2) analyze and evaluate the problem; (3) establish criteria by which a solution to the problem will be evaluated; (4) collect the data; (5) formulate and select a preferred solution; and (6) implement the preferred solution. Varney (1967) and Howerton (1971) attempted to study and to verify the process and sequence in Griffiths' decision-making model. Their findings indicated that staff members were usually involved in defining and identifying problems, but frequently omitted evaluating alternative modes of action.

Drucker (1966) believed that sound decisions were dependent upon "the clash of conflicting views, the dialogue between different points of view, and the choice between different judgments" (p. 148). Larson and Wasburn (1969) concluded that the best possible solution or decision would most likely be made if all possible options

or alternatives were identified.

Various elements of the Griffiths' decision-making model were incorporated into the propositions gathered from the research completed by Franse (1978), Fantini (1972), and Ward and Lehman (1972), and utilized in developing a participation rating scale for classifying data in this study. Griffiths' step one, to recognize, define and limit the problem was incorporated into the 'instituting' mode of participation. Griffiths' second step, to analyze and evaluate the problem; step three, to establish criteria by which a solution to the problem will be evaluated; and the fourth step, to collect the data; were merged into the 'collaborating' mode of participation. Griffiths' step five, to formulate and select a preferred solution, was incorporated into the 'advising' mode and the 'authorizing' mode of participation while the sixth step, to implement the preferred solution, was combined into the 'evaluating' mode of participation.

The district parent advisory council, a formal organization within the larger school district social system, was the main focus of this study. Hrebiniak (1978) viewed the organization as "a social collectivity that engages in purposeful exchange relationships with its environment" (p. 3). Kast and Resenzweig (1979) considered the organization as an "open, sociotechnical system

composed of a number of subsystems" (p. 108). Knight and McDaniel (1979) identified an organization as "a complex social unit deliberately designed to achieve a specific purpose or set of purposes" (p. 5). Zey-Ferrell (1979) defined organizations more broadly and considered them to be:

> goal-oriented collectives that consist of groups of individuals and in turn comprise social institutions. Organizations have relatively identifiable boundaries that are open to the environment, and they possess technologies, structures, processes, and perform activities with varying degrees of effectiveness and efficiency (p. 11).

Several theorists outlined the characteristics of organizations. Porter et al. (1975) indicated that five basic factors characterized organizations: (1) goal orientation; (2) social composition; (3) intended rational coordination; (4) differentiated functions; and (5) continuity through time. Radford (1978) suggested that "the structure of an organization depended upon such factors as its size, the technology with which it is involved, and nature of its environment" (p. 50). Knight and McDaniel (1979) maintained that the characteristics of an organization included: (1) a locus of power; (2) substitutability of personnel; (3) a division of labor among personnel; and (4) a history or memory of its past or standard operating procedures.

Other theorists characterized the organization as

a social system. Getzels and Guba (1957) considered the organization to be a social system which included a hierarchical role structure. They maintained that for each role there were certain behavioral expectations, and that everyone in the social system had certain expectations and perceptions of how those in other roles would behave. Bertalanffy (1972) conceived of the open system as "a set of elements standing in interrelation among themselves and with the environment" (p. 417). Steers (1977) believed that an open system "is composed of three basic components: inputs, thoughtputs, and outputs" (p. 10). Hrebiniak (1978) suggested that "every organization is an open system with respect to its environment. It engages in exchange with elements of its environment to attain necessary inputs and dispose of outputs..." (p. 9).

Owens (1970) characterized the bureaucratic form of organization as "an administrative system that is adapted to the needs of large and complex organizations that deal with large numbers of clients" (p. 56). Swingle (1976) stated that a bureaucracy "is the concentration of decision-making power in a single person or single center" (p. 11).

Kranz (1976) suggested that the functions or purposes of a bureaucracy were (1) service or the rendering by the bureaucratic organization of efficient and

economical service for the protection of the rights of the citizenry; (2) public employment, or the offer of jobs and economic improvement for the citizenry; and (3) representation, or the ability of the bureaucratic organization to allow for citizen participation and group representation in a democracy. Seitz (1978) stated that a bureaucracy was:

> a special form of social organization that provides procedures to elaborate and administer substantive guidelines for structuring political action through the delegation and specialization of authority (p. 10).

Weber (1947) felt that bureaucratic organizations were unidimensional. Several investigators, however, confirmed the multi-dimensionality construct of organizations such as Reimann (1973), Child (1972), and Pugh et al. (1968).

Pugh et al. (1968) studied 46 work organizations in England and affirmed the multi-dimensionality of the bureaucratic organizational structure. Child (1972) replicated the study made by Pugh et al. (1968) and utilized 82 British business organizations in his investigation. He found that the multi-dimensional model of organizations was more descriptive of service organizations rather than manufacturing firms due to differing contextual variables such as autonomy and technology of these kinds of organizations. Reimann (1973) found that organizations were multi-dimensional and that:

> while a single dimension may be sufficient for a

> particular kind of organization in a given environment, several dimensions may be needed to describe and compare organizations in a more general sense (p. 463).

McKee (1974) believed that formal organizations were:

> constructed for the pursuit of relatively specific objectives. It is goal specificity that makes it possible for organizations to build a rational structure: that is, one in which activities are organized so as to lead efficiently to a previously defined goal (p. 149).

Kast and Rosenzweig (1979) suggested that the formal organization was:

> the planned structure and represents the deliberate attempt to establish patterned relationships among components that will meet the objectives effectively. The formal structure is typically the result of explicit decision-making and is prescriptive in nature (p. 199).

Owens (1970) indicated that within the formal organization was an informal structure "essential to the functioning and administration of an organization" (p. 50). Moreover, he felt informal or primary groups had great power within the informal organization. Bobbitt et al. (1974) considered the informal organization as comprising the "connective links between persons based on individual personality characteristics and permits social relations that recognize the unique qualities of each person" (p. 113). Gibson (1979) maintained that informal groups were "natural groupings of people in the work situation in response to social needs" (p. 261). These informal groups evolved

naturally rather than emerged as a result of deliberate design. Moreover, he divided informal groups as comprising interest groups and friendship groups.

In summation, decision-making, according to Griffiths (1959), tends to take place in sequential order. Dahl (1970) had argued that any decision-making takes place within the context of particular group membership. Owens (1970) pointed out the importance of specifying whether the structure of decision-making was formal, informal, or some combination of both. The present investigation attempted to integrate these three theoretical bases: organizational structure theory, group membership theory, and decision-making theory.

With respect to organizational structure theory, the district parent advisory councils constituted a formal organization within the organizational structure. In the present investigation, the informal structure was not studied. With respect to group membership theory, two groups, school professionals and lay community groups constituted the two major groups making up the district parent advisory council.

With respect to decision-making theory, Griffiths' ideas of sequential progress in decision-making were adapted in such a way as to permit a questionnaire to be developed that would assess participants' perceptions of

each of the five categories of decision-making. The perceptions of decision-making activities within five significant activities of concern constituted important foci of possible differences between the two groups, both of whom are members of the same organizational structure.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

To ensure understanding and semantic clarity, the following terms were defined in this study: Advising, American Pluralism, Authorizing, Collaborating, Collaborative Planning, Community Control, Community Planning Board, Community School Board Chairperson, Community School District, Compensatory Education, Complex Organization, Decentralization, Decision-Making Activities, Decision-Making Process, Degree of Participation, District Parent Advisory Council, District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale, District Superintendent, Educational Needs Assessments, Educational Professionals, Elite, Evaluating, Financial Management of Reimbursables, Formal Organization, Instituting, Informal (Primary) Organization, Intermediate School, Junior High School, Lay Community Groups, Non-Involvement, Non-Professional Personnel or Non-Professionals, Personal Data Fact Sheet, Polyarchy, Power Structure, Principal of Title I Schools,

Program Evaluation and Implementation, Project Selection, Respondents, Rubber Stamp, School District Social System, Teachers of Title I Pupils, Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Part A) 1965, Title I Programs and Projects, Title I Target Youngsters, and Years of Experience in Educational Decision-Making.

Advising. In this study the term, advising, referred to specific recommendations made by district parent advisory councils regarding Title I programs and projects under consideration. Specifically, this response indicated the fifth choice on the degree of participation scale of the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale.

American Pluralism. In this study the term, American Pluralism, referred to multiple centers of power none of which were wholly sovereign, and which existed to make decisions, secure the consent of all, and settle conflicts peacefully.

Authorizing. In this study the term, authorizing, referred to the approval of decisions regarding Title I programs and projects by district parent advisory council members before they were carried out. Specifically, this response indicated the sixth choice on the degree of participation scale of the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale.

Collaborating. In this study the term, collaborating, referred to consultations by district parent advisory councils with district superintendents and community school board members before reaching final decisions on Title I programs and projects. Specifically, this response indicated the fourth choice on the degree of participation scale of the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale.

Collaborative Planning. In this study the term, collaborative planning, referred to the process whereby district parent advisory council members consulted periodically to plan, develop, implement, and evaluate Title I programs and projects with the district school superintendent, deputy superintendent in charge of instruction, and community school board members. Specifically, this term referred to the extent of district parent advisory council participation with school district personnel in meeting the special educational needs of economically and educationally deprived children with E.S.E.A. Title I programs and projects.

Community Control. In this study the term, community control, referred to "a degree of self-determination by residents of communities within urban areas" (Novack, 1975, p. 3).

Community Planning Board. In this study the term,

community planning board, referred to local neighborhood citizens who resided within the community, served without compensation, had professional and other significant interest in a district, and whose main purpose was to take an active part in improving the quality of life in a community. (Community Planning Board 12 Bronx, New York Descriptive Circular 1980, pp. 1-4.)

Community School Board Chairperson. In this study the term, community school board chairperson, referred to that individual elected by the eligible voters in each of the 33 decentralized school districts in New York City to serve on the community school board of a school district. Community school board members are involved in the decision-making process of Title I Elementary and Secondary Education (1965) programs and projects.

Community School District. In this study the term, community school district, referred to a decentralized local public school system in New York City responsible for the education of elementary school, intermediate school, and junior high school students from kindergarten to grade nine, as defined by New York State Law.

Compensatory Education. In this study the term, compensatory education, referred to compensatory services and the setting up of goals and objectives provided to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children primarily through programs in reading, mathematics,

language arts and bilingual-bicultural education, funded under Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965).

Complex Organization. In this study the term, complex organization, referred to the roles:

> that comprise its formal structure. These roles are occupied by the individuals who 'behave' in accordance with established prescriptions for their roles. In such an organization, the structure of roles remains constant. This constant structure of roles,... distinguishes the complex organization from smaller and simpler groups in which the structure of roles may be less defined and not as well ordered (Owens, 1970, pp. 48-49).

Decentralization. In this study the term, decentralization, referred to an administrative readjustment in a school system enabling more individuals, namely, community persons, to take part in the decision-making process. It referred primarily to the New York State Education Law (1969) which instituted 33 autonomous community school districts under the jurisdiction of community school boards in New York City.

Decision-Making Activities. In this study the term, decision-making activities, referred to specific tasks or duties of district advisory council members in the decision-making process. The decision-making areas investigated were: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation. These specific activities

were mandated by the Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), and were measured by means of the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale designed by the researcher.

Decision-Making Process. In this study the term, decision-making process, referred to a continuous and sequential procedure, namely: diagnosing the situation, discovering alternatives, analyzing, and selecting a plan to follow (Knezevich, 1969, p. 69).

Degree of Participation. In this study the term, degree of participation, referred to the degree of level of activity to which district parent advisory council members were involved in the decision-making process of Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) related to the following five decision-making activities: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation. Specifically, the eight possible responses, descriptors or scalar values, for the degree of participation were (1) non-involvement; (2) rubber stamp; (3) instituting; (4) collaborating; (5) advising; (6) authorizing; (7) evaluating; (8) other factors.

District Parent Advisory Council. In this study the term, district parent advisory council, referred to an organization made up of:

at least 51 percent of parents of children serviced by

> Title I programs, who are not Board of Education (New York City) employees, and 49 percent of the council made up of community organizations professional and paraprofessional representation (Board of Education of the City of New York, Office of Reimbursable Programs, Memorandum II 22, SY 1976-1977, p. 2).

Specifically, district advisory council members were involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) programs and projects, and were the main focus of this study.

District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale. In this study the term, District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale, referred to the data gathering instrument used in the study and designed by the researcher. The scale measured the perceptions of educational professionals which comprised district superintendents, principals of Title I schools, and teachers of Title I pupils and the perceptions of non-professional personnel which consisted of parent advisory council members, chairpersons of community school boards, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects relative to: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation. The District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale contained five above mentioned decision-making activities and 45

identical items that dealt with the five district parent advisory council decision-making activities.

District Superintendent. In this study the term, district superintendent, referred to the chief school officer responsible for the direction of schools in a local school administrative unit or school district elected by and responsible to the local community school board members, and entrusted with providing leadership to the professional, paraprofessional, and support staff in the improvement of instruction.

Educational Needs Assessments. In this study the term, educational needs assessments, referred to surveys conducted by a local educational agency or school district to determine specific needs of educationally disadvantaged youngsters in order to provide a sound basis for the planning of special Title I programs and projects. Specifically, educational needs assessments were undertaken to:

> (1) identify educationally deprived children in all eligible attendance areas and to select those educationally deprived children who have the greatest need for special assistance; (2) identify the general instructional areas on which the program will focus; and (3) determine the special educational needs of participating children with specificity sufficient to facilitate development of high-quality programs and projects (Education Amendments of 1978 - Public Law 95-561 Section 124, p. 2164).

Educational Professionals. In this study the term, educational professionals, referred to the district (community) superintendents, principals of Title I schools,

and teachers of Title I pupils who took part in this study.

Elite. In this study, the term, elite, referred to the:

> corporate sector or those who occupy formal positions of authority in institutions, the governmental sector or those who occupy formal positions of authority in the major civilian and military bureaucracies of the national government, and the public interest sector or those who occupy formal positions of authority in the mass media, the prestigious law firms, the major philanthropic foundations, the leading universities, and the recognized national civic and cultural organizations (Dye 1979, pp. 11-13).

Evaluating. In this study the term, evaluating, referred to the district parent advisory council appraising the implementation of educational decisions regarding Title I programs and projects designed by the district superintendent, community school board members, and district parent advisory council members. Specifically, this response indicated the seventh choice on the degree of participation scale of the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale.

Financial Management of Reimbursables. In this study the term, financial management of reimbursables, referred to the distribution of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) funds allocations for Title I programs and projects in Title I schools for the planning, implementation and operation and evaluation of Title I programs, for the improvement and expansion of elementary and secondary school programs, and for upgrading the educational opportunities of youngsters from disadvantaged areas. Specifically, the term referred to district parent

advisory council involvement in the financial management of Title I funds with district superintendents and community school board members so as to meet the special educational needs of Title I target youngsters in designated Title I schools (A Compendium of E.S.E.A. Title I Programs, New York City Board of Education, 1978, p. 16).

Formal Organizations. In this study the term, formal organizations, referred to those organizations whose principal characteristic was that they had been expressly established with the expressed purpose of achieving certain goals and objectives (Blau and Scott, 1962, p. 5).

Instituting. In this study the term, instituting, referred to district parent advisory council members, district superintendents, or community school board members initiating the action of an activity concerning Title I programs and projects. Specifically, this response indicated the third choice on the degree of participation scale of the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale.

Informal (Primary) Organization. In this study the term, informal or primary organization, referred to those members within a formal organization who voluntarily and reciprocally interacted with each other on matters of individual or collective concern (Farrell, 1972, p. 9).

Intermediate School. In this study the term, intermediate school, referred primarily to a public school organized by grades five through nine or other combinations

of such grade levels (Franse, 1978, p. 20). Specifically, this term referred to local intermediate schools selected for this study and located in seven school districts in the Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn in New York City.

Junior High School. In this study the term, junior high school, referred primarily to a public school organized by grades six through nine or other combinations of such grade levels (Franse, 1978, p. 20). Specifically, this referred to local junior high schools selected for this study and located in seven school districts in the Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn in New York City.

Lay Community Groups. In this study the term, lay community groups, referred to the sample of district parent advisory council members, chairpersons of community school boards, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards of seven school districts in the Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn in New York City. Specifically, this group comprised non-professional personnel or non-professionals.

Non-Involvement. In this study the term, non-involvement, referred to the non-participation of district parent advisory council members in a particular educational decision-making activity regarding Title I programs and projects. Specifically, this response indicated the first choice on the degree of participation rating scale of the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale.

Non-Professional Personnel or Non-Professionals. In

this study the term, non-professional personnel or non-professionals, referred to district parent advisory council members, parents of Title I pupils, community school board chairpersons, and chairpersons of community planning boards who took part in this study.

Parents of Title I Pupils. In this study the term, parents of Title I pupils, referred not only to parents who served on district parent advisory councils, but also to parents at large of Title I target children in designated Title I schools.

Participation. In this study the term, participation, referred to the active involvement of district parent advisory council members in specific educational activities of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Specifically, these decision-making activities included: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation.

Perception. In this study the term, perception, referred to the ability of district superintendents, district parent advisory council members, community school board chairpersons, principals of Title I schools, teachers of Title I pupils and community planning board chairpersons to make judgments concerning the participation of district parent advisory councils in educational decision-making with regard to Title I programs and projects in selected New

York City elementary schools, intermediate schools, and junior high schools in the Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn in New York City.

Personal Data Fact Sheet. In this study the term, Personal Data Fact Sheet, referred to the data gathering instrument utilized to describe the subjects precisely and to collect data for the demographic variables of age, sex and years of experience in educational decision-making. The two groups involved in the study were Educational Professionals which comprised district superintendents, principals of Title I schools, and teachers of Title I pupils and Non-Professionals or Non-Professional Personnel, which consisted of district parent advisory council members, chairpersons of community school boards, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects.

Polyarchy. In this study the term, polyarchy or representative democracy, referred to a system of government that has been essentially liberalized and popularized and open to public contestation and participation of subordinate governmental and social organizations as well as of the national government.

Power Structure. In this study the term, power structure, referred to a small number of individuals who are involved in formulating and extending policy rather than those exercising power within a given power unit or

organization (Hunter, 1953, p. 7).

Principal of Title I Schools. In this study the term, principal of Title I schools, referred to the professional leader, the supervisor of the instructional program, the counselor of students, the school disciplinarian, the liaison between teachers and the superintendent, the pupil-relations representative for the attendance area, the manager of school facilities, the director and evaluator of teaching efforts, and the supervisor of custodial and food-service employees within the building (Knezevich, 1969, p. 283).

Program Evaluation and Implementation. In this study the term, program evaluation and implementation, referred to educational programs funded in whole or in part by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965--Section 205(a)(5)--and which are required by law to be evaluated annually as a condition for funding.

The Office of Funded Programs publication, A Compendium of E.S.E.A. Title I Programs 1976-1977; 1977-1978 included the code of Federal Regulation Title 45, 116, 22 (a,b,c,) which provided for the evaluation and implementation of Title I programs and projects by means of the Mailed Information Report in monitoring program implementation and assessing program effectiveness.

Project Selection. In this study the term, project selection, referred primarily to the involvement of district parent advisory council members, district superintendents,

deputy superintendents for instruction, community school board members, principals and teachers of Title I schools in the selection of Title I programs to be transmitted to the State for approval (Board of Education of the City of New York, Guidelines for Advisory Councils, 1971, p. 2). Specifically, project selection and program selection were synonymous terms.

Respondents. In this study the term, respondents, referred to members of two groups, Educational Professionals and Non-Professional Personnel, who answered and returned the instrument. Specifically, the Educational Professionals were comprised of seven district superintendents, 31 principals of Title I schools, and 30 teachers of Title I pupils, while the Non-Professionals consisted of ten district parent advisory council members, ten community school board chairpersons, 30 parents of Title I pupils, and ten chairpersons of community planning boards from selected elementary, intermediate, and junior high schools in seven school districts in the Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn in New York City.

Rubber Stamp. In this study the term, rubber stamp, referred to district advisory council member blanket acceptance of an educational decision made by district-unit administrators and community school board members for Title I programs and projects. Specifically, this response indicated the second choice on the degree of participation scale of the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating

Scale.

School District Social System. In this study the term, school district social system, referred to "all members of a school organization working to achieve the goals of the school district" (Sergiovanni and Carver, 1973, p. 177).

Social System. In this study the term, social system, referred to:

> a bounded collection of interdependent parts, devoted to the accomplishment of some goal or goals, with the parts maintained in a steady state in relation to each other and the environment by means of (1) the standard modes of operation and (2) feedback from the environment about the consequences of system actions (Miles, 1954, p. 13).

Teachers of Title I Pupils. In this study the term, teachers of Title I pupils, referred to regularly certificated New York City public school teachers who were responsible for meeting the special educational needs of economically and educationally deprived children (Title I target children) in designated Title I schools in New York City.

Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Part A) PL 89-10, 1965. In this study the term, Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act, referred to a federal law known originally as PL 89-10 and enacted in 1965 with the following specific objectives: "to expand and improve educational programs to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children in low income areas" (Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, 1972, pp. 259-260).

Title I Programs and Projects. In this study the term, Title I programs and projects, referred to Title I

Elementary and Secondary Education federally funded special programs and projects in the priority areas of reading, language arts, mathematics, and bilingual-bicultural education and designed to meet the special educational needs of Title I target youngsters in designated Title I public schools of New York City.

Title I Target Youngsters. In this study the term, Title I target youngsters, referred to those children in the New York City public and nonpublic schools who resided within a target public school attendance area and who were educationally disadvantaged youngsters in eligible attendance areas who were usually identified by studying school records and standardized test scores in the priority areas of reading and mathematics. Specifically, the term referred to target youngsters who were not on grade level because of economic, social, language, or cultural problems, and receiving concentrated instruction in reading, language arts, mathematics, and bilingual-bicultural education as required by the Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) (A Compendium of E.S.E.A Title I Programs, New York City Board of Education, 1978, p. 12; Title I E.S.E.A.: How It Works, 1978, p. 60).

Years of Experience in Educational Decision-Making. In this study the term, years of experience in educational decision-making, referred to the number of years a

respondent was involved in education and making non-trivial decisions in that field. Specifically, this term referred to the reply of an educational professional or of a non-professional to the statement, Years of Experience in Educational Decision-Making on the Personal Data Fact Sheet, a component of the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Parent advisory councils in New York City make up an organizational structure whereby parents and citizens participate in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of funded, state, federal, and foundation programs.

One of the most important features of Title I is its legal command that parents be involved on a meaningful basis in every aspect of planning, operating, and evaluating programs at the local level (A Handbook on Title I Applications, 1979, p. 3). Moreover, on August 21, 1974, Public Law 93-380 extended parent participation by "requiring that both district-wide and school councils be formed" (Title I E.S.E.A.: How It Works, 1978, p. 21).

This study sought to determine and compare the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) as perceived by professional school groups and lay community groups and included the following decision-making

activities: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation. This study should provide information on the distributions of responses of educational professionals and non-professionals in the five mandated decision making activities. These descriptive data could be expected to be of interest to parents, educators, and community groups who were concerned with the functioning of district parent advisory councils in New York City. The findings of this study, moreover, should indicate to council members on the district-unit level the extent of their participation in educational decision-making with regard to Title I E.S.E.A. programs and projects in the five above mentioned decision-making activities.

Greater cooperation will be required between district parent advisory council members and school and community groups if educationally deprived youngsters are to catch up with other children of their age and grade level. Moreover, district advisory council members, district superintendents, and community school board members need to know the guidelines for responsible advisory council participation in educational decision-making, and the limits imposed upon the types of council member participation.

The effectiveness of district parent advisory

councils, it appeared, depended largely upon the extent of their involvement in the decision-making process and upon the working relationship parent advisory councils developed with each of the selected populations in the district and school-unit levels. This working relationship might be greatly influenced by how each group perceived the decision-making function of district parent advisory councils.

The findings of this study should be reviewed by principals of Title I schools and by teachers of Title I pupils. An important function of the school-unit advisory council is to provide the necessary data concerning educationally deprived youngsters. This important information is required by the principal and teaching staff of Title I schools in setting up performance goals and objectives, in determining the educational needs of disadvantaged youngsters in their schools, and in preparing the Title I application. Moreover, differences in the perception of the degree of participation of school-unit advisory councils may be associated with an individual's role within the educational system and the extent of their formal education relative to professional concerns in education. Educational professionals may view the degree of participation of advisory councils quite differently from non-professionals.

The results of this study should be of interest to

the five legally mandated activities of decision-making.

It would be of practical significance for administrators and of theoretical significance for educational researchers to recognize that differences in role conceptions within a bureaucracy have been a focus of study for more than four decades (Reissman, 1949).

This research should provide data concerning distinctions made among the five decision-making activities by non-professional personnel. These data should be of significance to those educational researchers whose focus of interest centers about group membership and its relation to the perception of organizational functioning.

The results of this study should provide data contrasting the responses of educational professionals and non-professionals' views of the functioning of district parent advisory councils relative to the five legally mandated decision-making activities. Moreover, these data should also have both practical and theoretical significance to educational researchers and practitioners. It is clearly important for both groups to know the extent to which there are common perceptions of participation in the legally mandated activities of concern.

At a practical level, this study should offer insights into the contrast of perceptions of those involved professionally in education and those who are involved in

education but without the special training of professional educators. This should be theoretically significant in that the influence of professional training and membership in formal organizations has been studied by sociologists and psychologists interested in the study of organizations and the perceptions of organizational functioning (Shaw, 1973 and Sherif, 1948).

If district parent advisory councils are to function efficiently and minimize conflict, it would seem advisable to attempt to increase the congruance between the views of non-professionals in the educational system and the educational professionals who have important roles in decision-making. The results of this study should, moreover, help to focus attention upon potential areas of conflict and agreement.

This study has introduced the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale, an instrument for assessing perceptions of the degree of participation in parent advisory councils along the dimensions of the decision-making process suggested by Griffiths (1959). This instrument was translated into Spanish as well as being available in English.

It is reasonable to anticipate that the participation rating scale will be useful to school districts that are experiencing conflict, or where a

conflict may develop within their parent advisory councils. As was demonstrated in the present study, the instrument may be employed to detect areas of differences in perception between educational professionals and non-professional personnel participating in decision-making.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This research was limited with respect to its scope, subjects, materials, general procedures, and statistical techniques. The scope of the general research situation was limited to a consideration of five decision-making activities for district parent advisory council members for Title E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects. In addition, the scope of this investigation was limited by the number of intervening or mediating variables studied. Specifically, these variables were age, sex and years of experience in educational decision-making.

The subjects for this investigation were limited to the responses of seven district superintendents, 31 principals of Title I schools, 30 teachers of Title I pupils, ten district parent advisory council members, ten community school board chairpersons, 30 parents of Title I pupils, and ten chairpersons of community planning boards in selected elementary, intermediate, and junior high schools in seven school districts in the Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn in

New York City which completed and returned the instrument. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study were also limited by the extent to which the subjects represented the total population of district parent advisory council members, district superintendents, principals of Title I schools, teachers of Title I pupils, community school board chairpersons, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards in seven school districts in the Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn in New York City.

This study was also limited by the materials used. The instrument utilized in this investigation, the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale, developed by the investigator, was limited in its capacity to elicit valid and reliable responses from the subjects, namely, district parent advisory council members, district superintendents, community school board chairpersons, principals of Title I schools, teachers of Title I pupils, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards with regard to the participation of district parent advisory councils in selected decision-making activities of Title I programs and projects. The instrument was limited to measuring only those aspects for which it was designed, namely, the five decision-making activities. These

activities included: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation. Moreover, the participation scale was limited to eight possible responses which were: (1) non-involvement; (2) rubber stamp; (3) instituting; (4) collaborating; (5) advising; (6) authorizing; (7) evaluating; and (8) other factors. In addition, the instrument was further limited by: (1) the interpretation of the questionnaire items by the respondents and (2) the accuracy of the perceptionnaire items by the respondents.

Finally, this study was limited by the appropriateness of the specific and general procedures and the statistical technique utilized by the researcher.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This study was presented in five (5) chapters. Chapter I consisted of an introduction, the statement of the problem, the theoretical rationale, the definition of the terms, the significance of the study, the limitations of the study and the organization of the study. Chapter II presented a survey of related literature on parental involvement in the schools, related literature on the

accomplishments of parent advisory councils, and related literature on the differences in attitudes and perceptions between and within educational professionals and non-professional personnel. Chapter III described the subjects, the materials, the procedures, and the statistical techniques employed in the investigation. Chapter IV consisted of a presentation of the findings of the study after a statistical analysis of the collected data. The summary, conclusions and recommendations for practitioners and for further research were incorporated into Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This study was concerned with the participation of district parent advisory councils in Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects which included the following decision-making activities: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation.

For clarity of presentation, this chapter was divided into three sections:

1. Related Literature Regarding Parental Participation in the Schools;

2. Related Literature Regarding Accomplishments of Parent Advisory Councils;

3. Related Literature Regarding Attitudes of Educational Professionals and Non-Professionals Concerning the Decision-Making Process.

RELATED LITERATURE REGARDING PARENTAL PARTICIPATION IN THE SCHOOLS

The purpose of this section was to review the related literature pertaining to parental participation in education. This included books, dissertations and periodicals that have referred to activities and programs parents have participated in in the schools.

Santostefano and Stayton (1967) suggested that extensive home-school interactions made for improvement in pupil achievement. They felt that the training of pupils in early cognitive functions promoted the effectiveness of the higher functions. Mothers who trained their preschool retarded youngsters rendered their youngsters' cognition more accessible to instruction by others. Such training by parents increased the youngsters' capacity to assimilate and to utilize instruction provided by others.

Jordan (1968) reported on a number of interesting activities by volunteer parent and community groups in the San Rafael, California schools. Among other things, community architects taught a unit on the structures of civilization, a local poet prepared and conducted lessons to encourage the creativity and imagination of youngsters, a savings and loan company executive taught an economics lesson to high school students, a well-known children's book author discussed the problems and rewards of writing a book, a chemical engineer provided help with advanced topics to talented mathematics pupils, and a local inventor explained and prepared a display for a patent process.

Sindledecker (1970) described a Shaker Heights, Ohio program for volunteer mothers who helped teachers develop new curricular materials such as tapes and recordings for teaching reading, foreign languages, art, and mathematics. The results of parental participation were improved pupil performance, as well as greater pupil interest and

motivation in school activities. The author indicated that "learning comes more alive for students particularly as it is combined with a mother who is giving something of herself in the process" (p. 10).

Sayler (1971) found that parent volunteers in the San Diego City Schools performed a great variety of instructional and counseling duties from the nursery through grade six. Volunteers assisted with play activities, prepared art materials, guided creative writing activities, helped set up science experiments, used manipulative materials with slow achievers, led small group discussions, evaluated new curricular materials, acted as interpreters for non-English speaking parents, and provided a one-to-one relationship for pupils who needed individual guidance counseling.

MacDonald (1971) reported on the Far West Regional Laboratory where parent participation and parent power brought about parental cooperation and involvement in solving local educational problems. He suggested that parent participation was essential to the success of the educational program.

McLaughlin et al. (1971) studied the effects of parents as home tutors on the achievement of their youngsters and discovered that such parent participation programs resulted in increased student skills and increased student motivation. The author, in a subsequent study, found also that parents' educational aspirations, self-worth and self-esteem actually increased after exposure to this kind of

meaningful school participation.

Elliott (1972) reported on a parent participation program at the Castro School in El Cerrito, California called Project 88. Parents participated in a variety of activities. They helped youngsters in mathematics and reading, prepared special materials such as multi-ethnic kits, corrected pupil papers, performed typewriting duties, kept records, tutored individual youngsters, helped in the school library, served on school committees, and shared their ethnic heritage with other youngsters by means of music, the dance, ethnic foods and special holidays.

Panek (1972) utilized parent volunteers recruited from the Parent Teachers Association. Volunteer aides improved the oral and silent reading skills as well as the word attack and comprehension skills of pupils. The general reading levels of youngsters also improved dramatically.

A study on parental participation in Head Start was discussed by Grotberg (1972). He indicated that the Head Start experience showed positive effects on the part of pupils with regard to improved scores concerning cognitive and social-emotional development.

An investigation on community participation in the planning and building of a new middle school in East Orange, New Jersey was reported by Einhaus (1972). Parents and their youngsters, as well as community persons volunteered suggestions and shared ideas with the professional staff in the school design process. As a result, professional and

lay participation brought about greater community involvement, more effective school-citizen communication, and helped to fulfill the basic wishes and desires of the community.

As principal of the J. Nelson Kelly Elementary School in Grand Forks, North Dakota, Abbott (1973) described a variety of activities in which the parents participated. The parental volunteer organization in this school, called V.I.S.T.C., or Volunteers in Service to Children, was responsible for individualized instruction and small group work such as supervising creative dramatics, recording language experience stories, conducting scientific experiments, producing tape recordings, serving as resource persons for enrichment activities, helping individual children with handwriting, and supervising individual field trips.

Thomas (1973), an Elk Grove, Illinois high school principal, recruited and utilized the services of parents and aides in what he called a 'Bring 'em Back Alive' program. Parents attended adult renewal classes and volunteered their services as talent aides, resource persons, and guest lecturers. Classes for parents were held in sociology, poetry, child development, the humanities, educational innovations, and counseling adolescents. Students whose parents participated in this program were compared to students whose parents did not. Those students whose parents took part in the program: "(1) had improved

their grade point average; (2) had lower absenteeism; and (3) indicated more positive attitudes toward school than students of non-participating parents" (p. 20). Participating parents, as a result of having taken part in this program, had a better understanding of the problems and concerns of school people and learned to "relate more effectively to their children" (p. 20).

The success of the Saturday School in the Ferguson-Florissant School District in Ferguson, Missouri (1973) indicated that the home and school could be effective partners in the learning process. The relationship between the home and school was fostered through parent participation in the Saturday School teaching team and the home teaching visits. The program of parent participation had helped parents to become more accepting of their youngsters, more aware of their needs, and more adept in their interactions with their youngsters. At the end of the second year of the project, 85 percent of the parents were utilizing more appropriate teaching techniques, using more positive means of motivation and reinforcement with their children, and accomplishing the assigned tasks.

Turman and Blatt (1974) described the individualized instruction program through Open Structure at the Carthay Center Elementary School, an urban school in Los Angeles, to meet the educational needs of a changing student population. The learning environment was informal, and a variety of learning centers existed to permit youngsters to integrate

their interests and abilities into the learning environment.

Johnson and O'Fallon (1975) evaluated the results of the Clinch-Powell Educational Cooperative Early Childhood Education Program. This was a parent-oriented, home-based program which served four rural Appalachian counties. As a result of parent participation, children who had participated in an early childhood program had scores significantly higher on the Metropolitan Readiness Test and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test than those youngsters who had not been in an early childhood program. Youngsters who had been in the program for two years scored significantly higher on the above mentioned tests than those who had been in the program for only one year. Parent evaluation of the program had been consistently positive for three years.

Thomas (1976) reported on the Lenox Early Childhood Outreach Program for Parents (LECOPP), a program which was implemented to correct educational problems among youngsters in the low income families at the Lenox Elementary School. Parents were trained to provide informal learning experiences in the home for the pre-kindergarten youngsters who were from 2.9 to 3.9 years of age.

Adkins and Ainsa (1978) were involved with parents of visually handicapped youngsters in the Early Childhood Learning Center, Region XIX, Education Center in El Paso, Texas. Parents of visually impaired youngsters outlined the

needs of their toddlers, and were involved in setting goals for developmental skills. Volunteer parents were taught to carry out therapeutic activities with their youngsters. They became involved in motor development activities, tactile stimulation activities, and auditory stimulation exercises. Self-help skills learned at the Education Center were carried over into the home environment. Moreover, parents participated in curricular planning, classroom assistance with individual youngsters and small groups, home-use written assignments, and construction of instructional materials.

Beckman (1979) described a program utilizing parent volunteers at the Lynbrook Elementary School in Bethesda, Maryland. Parent volunteers worked with small groups of youngsters in providing them with hands-on experience in science. Science activities were integrated with language arts experiences and problem solving activities. Field trips and excursions were an important aspect of the science program. Participating parents came to a clearer understanding of how children learned, and were better able to help their own youngsters. Parents were given opportunities to talk to children about possible career choices in the sciences as well.

Offenberg (1979) evaluated Project PACT, or Parents and Children Together, a program designed to complement the existing Let's Be Amigos Model A Bilingual Program at the Potter-Thomas School in Philadelphia. Project PACT was a

school-year program geared to basic academic competencies of adults. Included in the program were workshops and opportunities for parents to meet with curriculum designers. The major components of the project included Spanish and English language arts courses, which were instrumental in instructing parents with various aspects of the curriculum and school operation. Participating parents were also acquainted with the cultural resources of Philadelphia and neighboring cities.

Pupils of participating Project PACT parents had better English and Spanish reading scores than did pupils whose parents did not take part in the program. There was some evidence to suggest that parent participation was related to better pupil attendance. Analysis of parent interviews indicated a statistically significant gain in methods of helping their youngsters in schoolwork. Further, many of the parents earned high school equivalency diplomas.

Zajano and Davidson (1979) reported the results of the Burrillville Reading Observes Necessary Communication Objectives and Skills or BRONCOS, a federally funded Right-to-Read project operating in six Burrillville, Rhode Island schools. The major objective of this program was the improvement of youngsters' communication skills.

The BRONCOS project recruited and trained 24 parent volunteers and involved other community persons in school related activities. Community members worked with 62 professional staff members and approximately 2,000 kindergarten

school-year program geared to basic academic competencies of adults. Included in the program were workshops and opportunities for parents to meet with curriculum designers. The major components of the project included Spanish and English language arts courses, which were instrumental in instructing parents with various aspects of the curriculum and school operation. Participating parents were also acquainted with the cultural resources of Philadelphia and neighboring cities.

Pupils of participating Project PACT parents had better English and Spanish reading scores than did pupils whose parents did not take part in the program. There was some evidence to suggest that parent participation was related to better pupil attendance. Analysis of parent interviews indicated a statistically significant gain in methods of helping their youngsters in schoolwork. Further, many of the parents earned high school equivalency diplomas.

Zajano and Davidson (1979) reported the results of the Burrillville Reading Observes Necessary Communication Objectives and Skills or BRONCOS, a federally funded Right-to-Read project operating in six Burrillville, Rhode Island schools. The major objective of this program was the improvement of youngsters' communication skills.

The BRONCOS project recruited and trained 24 parent volunteers and involved other community persons in school related activities. Community members worked with 62 professional staff members and approximately 2,000 kindergarten

level of the parents, and family income data. Parent participation included group meetings, school visits, employment in the program, and telephone contacts.

The results showed that parent participation had positive effects on the youngsters' knowledge of verbal concepts, general reasoning, and school-related knowledge and skills. Moreover, parent participation appeared to affect school-related knowledge and skills and general reasoning regardless of a youngster's age, mother's education or family income. Further, the effect of a knowledge of verbal concepts was strongest for youngsters who scored lowest on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test at the beginning of the Prek program.

Chapman (1979) reported on the results of the Parent Education Follow Through Program or PEFT in the Yakima, Washington School District. The district enrolled approximately 12,000 students and employed 600 teaching staff members, administrators and central office staff persons. This program utilized paraprofessional and parent educators who worked with youngsters in kindergarten and first grade classrooms. Parents also worked with their youngsters at home.

The PEFT program in Yakima, Washington, was a dynamic force for social and institutional change. Parent and community participation brought about significant positive attitudes. The PEFT program improved the quality of home-school communication, parent-child interaction, and inter-

actions among peoples of different socio-economic backgrounds. Moreover, parental participation enabled low-income parents to become independently functioning members of society.

Rice (1979) related how parents in School District 25 in Arlington Heights, Illinois formed and operated a non-profit corporation that worked with the school system to provide string music instruction for the youngsters in the district schools. When the tax free referendum was defeated, a group of parents formed an organization called Music For Youth, which offered youngsters music instruction on a donation-only basis. The Music For Youth program offered children broader cultural interests, as well as music theory, fine motor coordination, and an increased sense of self-worth. Moreover, students had the opportunity to observe their parents doing something they cared about and believed in.

Forte (1980) reported on the Benchmark Project, E.S.E.A. Title I of the School District of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The Benchmark Project had as its main objective the improvement of current student achievement levels to a point equal to their potential achievement levels. Moreover, the Benchmark Project was a high intensity program designed to provide an effective cognitive learning environment.

Thomas (1980) indicated how parental and community involvement in the Miller Elementary School, a building

comprising 405 Black children from predominantly lower and working class families in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania helped to bring about better school discipline. An open door policy existed at Miller Elementary School whereby parents could visit school personnel at any time. The parents of Miller Elementary School, working with teachers and administrators, participated in many school activities. They volunteered as tutors, teacher aides, chaperones on field excursions and camping trips, and as advisors to after-school classes. The school's rapport with its parents and community members contributed to high morale among teachers, pupils and parents. Moreover, pupil attendance averaged 96 percent. Further, there were no suspensions at the Miller Elementary School for disciplinary infractions. It was a diagnostic-prescriptive program designed to assist selected Title I youngsters from the intermediate grades who scored below the 16th percentile on the California Achievement Test (CAT), but who did not qualify for special education programs.

Parents of Title I youngsters were encouraged to participate in project activities and workshops, parent education programs, classroom visitations and pupil homework activities. The program also provided for small group interactions, basic skills instruction, a language experience approach, teacher staff development, and development of positive pupil self-concepts. One thousand fifty-four students took part in the project and about 25 to 40 parents participated in workshop

activities each month in each school.

Parents confirmed the merits of the Benchmark Project. They took more interest in their children's school performance and attended planned meetings. Moreover, parents cited changes in attitude and behavior on the part of their youngsters.

Pupils scored at or near grade level on the California Achievement Test after three years in the program. This rate of increase continued after termination of the project at the end of the sixth grade.

The Montana State Department of Public Instruction (1980) issued a report of the results of the Northern Cheyenne Follow-Through Project, an early childhood approach to the teaching of basic skills utilizing individualized instruction techniques and parents as classroom teaching aides. This program focused on reading, mathematics and handwriting. Parental participation was an important component of this program.

Cheyenne parents helped enrich the curriculum by allowing youngsters to engage in such tribal cultural activities as Cheyenne language instruction, cooking of traditional tribal foods, beading, legend telling, dancing, and creation of ceremonial costumes as part of the instructional program. Cheyenne parents, moreover, also served as majority members of the Northern Cheyenne Follow-Through Policy Advisory Committee. They participated in decisions on matters such as program planning, staff selection, and

budget preparation.

Gains in enrollment and attendance were noted as a result of Project Follow-Through. Moreover, more youngsters were working on grade level. Further, Cheyenne parents went on to work toward a GED or a college degree.

Cordray (1981) reported on the Fail-Safe Program of the Houston, Texas Independent School District. The major objectives of Fail-Safe were to improve student achievement, increase career planning awareness, improve student discipline, promote home-school shared accountability for better student attendance, and provide career information and planning in the Houston elementary and secondary schools. The focus of the program was a twice yearly parent-teacher conference. The Student Achievement Profile, a computer printout, was the heart of the elementary school conference. Career development and occupational guidance were emphasized at the secondary school level conference. Moreover, a media campaign requested employers to give community people one or two hours off to attend school conferences.

The Spring, 1980, Fail-Safe conference had a parent attendance rate of 54 percent at the elementary school and 17 percent at the secondary level. In the Fall of 1980, there was an increase in the level of parent attendance at the conferences to 73 percent at the elementary level and 24 percent at the secondary school level.

As a result of parental participation in Fail-Safe, there was improved student attendance, increased student

achievement, positive parent and teacher evaluations of conferences and positive feedback on the use of instructional materials recently developed. Moreover, a comparison of student attendance between the 1978-1979 school year and the 1979-1980 school year revealed an increase of from 90.99 to 92.91 percent or an increase of 1.92 percent. More "time on task" was related to increasing achievement. Further, the analyses of standardized achievement composite test scores revealed that for the first time since 1966, the average academic achievement of students at every elementary grade tested in the Houston School District met or exceeded the national norm.

Hess (1981) reported on the San Diego, California Unified School District Partnership Program designed to help youngsters achieve academically, socially and personally in an integrated partnership. To help pupils achieve academically, parents, teachers, and students worked as a team to set goals and objectives and to systematically review pupil progress. To help pupils with their social and personal adjustment, parents participated in programs to increase their understanding of racial and human relations and multi-cultural activities which would help them respect cultural diversity. The Partnership Program was available to all pupils and families enrolled in schools which were actively engaged in the integration within the San Diego City School District's boundaries.

Parents attended classes to develop tutorial techniques and instructional materials. Further, parents tutored their youngsters at home to reinforce basic skills taught in the classroom setting. Parent-teacher-student meetings, home visits and telephone contacts provided ongoing follow-up. Over 200 parents who were most concerned about their children's progress were trained by the San Diego Partnership Program school personnel.

Youngsters in grades kindergarten through six in 57 elementary schools of San Diego took part in this program. The more than 200 parents who participated came from a variety of backgrounds.

As a result of parental participation in the program, the degree of pupil achievement far exceeded the expectations. Parents found that they and their children had more confidence and were more willing to assist in their youngsters' academic, social and emotion growth. Further, the parents had noted changes in their relationships with their children and the school.

Claiborne (1981) reported on a program in Chicago, Illinois designed to improve pupil achievement, attendance and attitudes toward school through better relationships between parents and teachers. School-community representatives or SCRs played an important part in the program. School-community representatives at the elementary school level visited homes of participating pupils every two months, sponsored workshops to instruct parents in techniques of

improving pupil attitudes toward learning, referred families in need of assistance to appropriate social agencies to ensure pupil attendance in school, and guided parents to help their youngsters function more effectively in the classroom. Parent participation included, but was not limited to, workshop participation, input in selection of programs, and visits to classrooms. Since 20,000 Title I target youngsters received the services of an SCR, approximately 20,300 families were involved in the program. One hundred eighty-three public schools and 33 private schools in Chicago were involved in the 1981 fiscal year.

The results of the study indicated that the objectives requiring significant improvement in pupil attendance and attitudes were met. A large majority of the school-community representatives made outstanding contributions to increasing parental participation in school affairs and in the welfare of target youngsters.

Hornbuckle (1981) described a program launched by the Dallas Independent School District (DISD) to encourage parents to get involved and become a part of the life of the school community by inviting participation in tutoring programs, assisting in crisis intervention counseling designed to improve school-community relations, inviting participation in school advisory committees, and understanding the roles and conditions of school life. Eight thousand families of low income disadvantaged youngsters took part in the program as well as students in grades four through twelve in 44

district schools.

Parental participation brought about a reduction in the number of student suspensions and parent conferences for disciplinary action, improved two-way communication between parents and school personnel, increased minority participation in tutoring programs and school advisory committees, and improved dissemination of information.

Smith (1981) reported on the Prescription Learning Laboratory Program of the Roosevelt School District No. 66 in Phoenix, Arizona. The objectives of the program were increased parental panel involvement and student achievement through school laboratory and home assistance services. Parents of Title I target youngsters worked within the laboratory setting conducting small-group reinforcement drill, assisting students with prescriptive activities in reading and mathematics, and assisting teachers with materials development and record keeping requirements. Eleven elementary schools and three junior high schools took part in the program as well as a majority of parents of 1,200 laboratory students enrolled in grades three through six.

As a result of parental participation, there was increased parental involvement in student learning activities, increased parent/school mutual support and communication, increased opportunity for "homebound" parent involvement and assistance, and increased parental awareness of student strengths and needs. Moreover, there were significant pupil

academic achievement gains as well as improved student self-concept.

Simmonds (1981) described the Family Activities to Maintain Enrollment or Project FAME in Baltimore, Maryland. The major objectives of Project FAME included offering parents opportunities to discuss topics relevant to the real world, to participate in school sponsored activities, to improve parental self-concept and self-image, to provide incentives for student attendance, and to strengthen student self-concepts through goal directed education. Ninety-three families with 243 children participated in the program. Two elementary schools, one junior high school and one senior high school were involved in the program.

Seventy-nine percent of the parents felt that their youngsters would continue their schooling due to participation in Project FAME. Fifty-three percent of the parents indicated an awareness of a positive change in their children's attitudes.

Students showed an increase in test scores ranging from two months to one year three months growth in all areas tested, as reflected in the California Achievement Test and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, grades one through six, eight and nine. Between 72.7 and 95.4 percent of all project pupils in grades one through five showed an improvement in their yearly attendance.

Harris (1981) described the Parent Trainer Volunteers and Tutors in Basic Skills for Adolescents in the Intermediate Schools of the New York City Board of Education,

New York University Metro Center, Community School Districts 13, 16, 17 and 23. This program was designed to train parents to tutor their youngsters in the basic skills of reading, writing, problem solving, numeracy, listening, and oral communication skills, as well as equip parents to train other parents to tutor their children in the basic skills, develop instructional materials for parents to utilize with their youngsters, and utilize parents as basic skills tutors in the local middle and junior high schools.

Weekly parent workshops were provided by the school district involved in the program. Seventy-seven schools in the four Brooklyn, New York districts as well as more than 100 parents of low income youngsters participated in the Basic Skills Program.

The Basic Skills Program brought about improved interaction between parents, students and school staffs. Further, parents improved their basic skills techniques for working with their youngsters.

Hess (1981) reported on Project ACT or Accountability in Citizenship Training of Duval County, Jacksonville, Florida. Project ACT was a federally funded program designed to reduce inappropriate behavior among pupils. Teachers, parents and students worked together as a "caring team" to assist youngsters in accepting responsibility for their behavior. Peer parents were trained to make home visits to parents of pupil participants and assist them in developing desirable behavior in their youngsters. The project consisted

of pupils in 14 fifth grade classes, 11 sixth grade classes, and three seventh grade classes who exhibited disruptive behavior. Parents of the above pupils also participated in this program.

As a result of parental participation in Project ACT, parents used less corporal punishment with their youngsters, and provided their children with encouragement and reinforcement. Further, parents were more involved with school.

Pupils developed improved self-concepts and assumed more responsibility for their actions. Pupil overall attendance also improved as a result of Project ACT.

Claiborne (1981) described the Institute for Parent Involvement Program in Chicago, Illinois designed to increase parents' understanding of their children, increase teachers' awareness of student needs, and improve student performance, especially in mathematics, English language skills and academic motivation. The Institute provided four program components: (1) preservice training/planning sessions for teachers, parents and aides; (2) prescriptions and materials to meet individual needs in reading and mathematics; (3) resource kits for parents containing workshop materials; and (4) follow-up workshops for teachers and aides on instructional and inter-personal skills. Three hundred ninety-one educationally and economically disadvantaged pupils participated in this program. Approximately 391 families also took part in this activity. Nine schools participated in fiscal 1981.

Parental attendance at the schools increased and there was greater participation in their children's education. Pupils' general school performance and academic motivation were also measurably improved.

RELATED LITERATURE REGARDING ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS

In the following section, two definitions of a citizen advisory committee were offered, along with a history of their establishment in American education. Moreover, this segment included the role of parent advisory councils in various states, the scope of advisory council activities within the educational community, as well as previous research focusing especially upon the degree of participation in educational decision-making.

Good (1973), editor of the Dictionary of Education, defined an advisory committee as:

> a group of persons usually outside the educational profession chosen to advise regarding an educational program; does not have final decision-making powers; offers advice to legally constituted administrative officials; used extensively in the cooperative extension service and in vocational education in agriculture (p. 18).

The National School Public Relations Association (1973) referred to citizen advisory committees as "wisdom dispersing and policy-guiding agencies" (p. 5). Robinson (1978) suggested that:

> The committees have been given responsibility for advising school authorities on almost every aspect of the school program, organization and policy. In addition to their advisory functions, citizens'

> committees have been seen by school authorities as an important and useful mechanism for channelling public criticism and controversy in education (p. 4).

The Handbook on Title I Applications (1978) indicated that a district advisory council referred to the parent advisory council for the entire school district which advised the district concerning the overall Title I program and reviewed the yearly application before it was sent to the state.

Parent advisory councils and committees have had an important impact on Title I programs and projects as well as a noticeable effect on pupil achievement. Sherck (1972) reported on the St. Louis, Missouri Advisory Committess. Advisory council contacts with the industrial sector had provided enrichment materials for vocational and technical programs. Among the materials contributed to vocational programs in the St. Louis County schools were complete new model cars and chasses, training filmstrips, mockups, and other numerous components for vocational education. The excellent record of employment of commercial art graduates was due primarily to management suggestions made by advisory committees. The committees had also endorsed training programs in specific mechanical skills necessary for entry employment. In short, these committees had helped to make learning more meaningful to vocational students because "the best learning takes place in realistic situations where the experiences students get are meaningful to them in preparation for their life work" (p. 35).

Jobe and Morton (1972) investigated an advisory council in Maryland. The Frederick County Advisory Council in Maryland was instrumental in obtaining increased funds and staff positions for vocational education purposes. The board of education adopted the concept of career education as well as the development of a career information program in the county elementary and junior high schools. These proposals were attributed primarily to the advisory council.

The citizens advisory council of Hackensack, New Jersey (1973) played a critical role in parental involvement in educational programs and program dissemination. Their work brought about the development of good school-community relations. Council and community members of Hackensack participated in an Open Door Policy whereby citizens were encouraged to visit the Project LEM or Learning Experience Module program in school. They were also encouraged to visit open space environments in classrooms, and were actively involved in Project LEM and workshops.

In Nebraska (1974), parent advisory councils helped to improve pupil achievement in reading, mathematics, social studies, and in the area of affective education. A random sample of 45 schools in the State of Nebraska were included in a study to evaluate reading and math scores by means of a 'self study reporting form.' Nebraska school districts requested test scores of all Title I pupils in reading from grades three through twelve. The evaluation report listed

scores for 14,929 students in reading. Nebraska school districts also required test scores of all Title I pupils in mathematics from grades three through twelve. The evaluation report listed scores for 3,424 students in mathematics.

As a result of parent and community participation in advisory council activities, staff visits, regional workshops, and inservice instruction, 60 percent of the schools reported improved reading skills such as word attack skills, phonetics, spelling, and speed and oral reading over 1973; 70 percent of the schools reported improved attitudes toward reading, as well as more positive behavior and improved motivation over 1973; 49 percent of the schools reported improvement in mathematics and social studies over 1973; and 58 percent of the schools reported greater self-confidence, independence and an improved self-image on the part of the youngsters. The mean gain in reading for over 14,000 students was 1.02. The mean gain in mathematics for over 3,000 students was 1.10.

May (1974) indicated that the local citizens council in Detroit, Michigan had an important impact on the educational program and on pupil achievement. The results of advisory council participation in Detroit schools were higher pupil achievement scores, less vandalism to physical plants, and increased support from business and labor for the objectives of education.

Parent advisory councils in North Platte, Nebraska (1975) initiated an E S.E.A. Title III 'packet program' for

pre-school youngsters. Packets containing materials parents could utilize with their infants to attain competencies in certain skills were distributed to the homes and made use of by the parents.

Parent advisory council members in Kansas (1975) were instrumental in helping to raise pupil achievement scores in reading and mathematics in the Unified School Districts. Of the total number of reading participants who were tested from grades one to twelve, 54 percent of the Title I target youngsters demonstrated more than one month gain per month of instruction. Of the total number of mathematics participants who were tested from grades one to twelve, 57 percent of the youngsters demonstrated more than one month gain per month of instruction.

Parent advisory councils in Ohio (1975) were significant in increasing the effectiveness of Title I programs. In fiscal 1975, more than 73,000 parents of Title I target youngsters in 596 school districts were involved in such activities as planning Title I programs, visiting Title I classrooms, and conducting individual conferences with Title I staff members and other school personnel. Effectiveness of instruction in reading was supported by significant gains made by Title I youngsters in reading achievement. The evaluation report indicated that 41 percent of the youngsters showed a gain of 15 months or more per ten months of instruction over 1974.

The State Advisory Council in Kentucky for Vocational Education and Manpower Development and Training (1975) indicated that the major areas in improving the quality of vocational education in the State were: greater use of vocational facilities, more involvement in manpower training for new and expanding industries, improved communication with the general public, more practical use of research funds, and greater use of community resources. Regional advisory committees also indicated other major areas to improve the quality of vocational education in Kentucky. These regional committees called for more funds for vocational education, more effective student counseling services, and more participation in cooperative programs. Moreover, needed social services for the disadvantaged and handicapped were sought, more emphasis on related subject matter was suggested, career education for all junior high school youngsters was recommended, and greater involvement by business and industry in vocational education was emphasized.

DuPree (1976) made a study of a North Carolina advisory committee. The policy advisory committee in western North Carolina, consisting of a majority of Cherokee Indian parents, implemented several innovative educational programs. Approaches such as Project Follow Through or the Englemann Becker Model, which was a modified nongraded departmentalized intermediate level program for Follow Through pupils; an E.S.E.A Title I program including elementary and secondary education remediation programs in mathematics, reading,

speech, language arts, hearing impaired instruction, and special education for slow learners, and a Learning Disabilities Program or Title VI diagnostic-prescriptive approach were instituted by the advisory council. The policy advisory committee was instrumental in improving pupil achievement, revising aspects of the traditional curriculum, and securing adequate funds for education. Statistics comparing the academic achievement of Cherokee youngsters with national norms for the years 1970 through 1975 indicated that in May, 1970, there were no records for kindergarten pupils for academic achievement. In May, 1975, 92 percent of the kindergarten youngsters were above the national norms in academic achievement. In May, 1970, no records were available for the first grade in academic achievement. In May, 1975, 79.9 percent of the first graders were above national norms in academic achievement. In May, 1970, 29.9 percent of the second graders were above national norms in academic achievement. In May, 1975, 83.9 percent of the second graders were above national norms in academic achievement. In May, 1970, 15.3 percent of the third graders were above national norms in academic achievement. In May, 1975, 81 percent of the third graders were above national norms in academic achivement. In May, 1970, 20.18 percent of the fourth graders were above national norms in academic achievement. In May, 1975, 43 percent of the fourth graders were above national norms in academic achievement. In May, 1970, 14.1 percent of the fifth graders were above national norms in academic achievement. In May,

1975, 42.1 percent of the fifth graders were above national norms in academic achievement. In May, 1970, 36.1 percent of the sixth graders were above national norms in academic achievement. In May, 1975, 58.5 percent of the sixth graders were above national norms in academic achievement.

Coburn (1977) described a community participation program in the Northwest. Community persons, local tribal committees and a planning council for each of the three regions of the Plains, Plateau, and Coastal Indians of the Pacific Northwest comprising Oregon, Washington, Idaho and Montana produced primary grade language arts materials which included activity units, teachers' manuals, and textbooks of Indian legends and stories for school youngsters. As a result of local committee participation in decision-making, curriculum materials which were developed reflected the cultural heritage of the various Indian tribes, and related to the everyday experiences of the Indian youngsters. Moreover, shy, withdrawn youngsters became more active participants in classroom activities, and enjoyed working with these matierals.

Meisels et al. (1978) described the activities of the advisory council involved in Project LINC or Learning in Integrated Classrooms, a training program for mildly and moderately handicapped youngsters, three to six years of age, at the Eliot-Pearson Children's School, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts. The advisory council members involved in Project LINC were parents in the Children's

School and not a council chosen from outside the school population.

The advisory council members advised the project director and kept the school population informed and involved in Project LINC activities and objectives. Moreover, the council had developed a resource library for parents in the Children's School and helped form small affinity groups to meet with parents to explain the concept of mainstreaming. Further, they invited public school special education supervisors to attend advisory council meetings, and developed a slide-tape for parents entitled "Parents Talk About Mainstreaming."

The National Advisory Council on Indian Education (1979) consisting of 15 Indian and Alaska Native members, empowered by the United States Commissioner of Education and the Congress of the United States concerning the administration of programs for Indian youngsters and adults submitted its Sixth Annual Report to the Congress and made seven recommendations. Among the proposals were that:

> (1) the organizational structure of the Office of Indian Education remain a distinct and separate organizational entity within the Department of Education; (2) that Indian Educational Programs contained in Title IV of Public Law 92-318 remain separate and distinct programs; and (3) that the National Advisory Council on Indian Education (NACIE) remain intact and continue its advisory duties (p. 1).

Other recommendations included finding Indian controlled community colleges and the advisability of a Telecommunication Satellite for programs related to Indian education.

Mizell (1980) indicated that the American Friends Service Committee project of the Southeastern Public Education Program (SEPEP) helped and strengthened the implementation of parent participation requirements of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965). The Southeastern Public Education Program, or SEPEP, had provided assistance to parent advisory council members in Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina and Georgia. The American Friends Service Committee Project found that parent advisory councils were continuously struggling for legitimacy and role definition in most of the rural South. In spite of the difficulties encountered by the SEPEP staff, they did find parents and school officials who had a positive outlook and contributed to the successful implementation of parent advisory committees. Factors that contributed to successful parent involvement requirements of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) were:

> (1) a clear message from the school of 'we want your support'; (2) regular monthly meetings devoted to legitimate concerns; (3) efforts to educate parents about the program; and (4) activities of state and federal officials charged with enforcing Title I laws (p. 1).

Several theorists in decision-making and parent participation studies conceptualized various modes of participation for groups and individuals in the decision-making process. Cunningham (1969) suggested that parents should acquire the necessary expertise for effective participation which comprised: (1) the collaborative or consultative mode where parents were informed about an

action before a decision had been made; (2) the shared participation mode where parents and administrators worked together in reaching educational decisions; (3) the advisory mode where an opportunity was given to parents to offer an opinion about a decision under deliberation; and (4) community control which allowed parents to dominate the process of educational decision-making.

Lehman and Ward (1972) as well as Hamilton (1972) listed several essential participation modes for groups and individuals. They indicated that: (1) groups and individuals should be responsible for initiating decision action and carrying it through; (2) groups and individuals should be informed of decisions under consideration; (3) groups and individuals should approve of decisions made by another individual; and (4) groups and individuals should be consulted on decisions (Lehman and Ward, 1972, p. 45; Hamilton, 1972, pp. 668-671).

Rosener (1975) indicated that advisory councils should be involved in evaluation of Title I programs. Advisory councils, he believed, should evaluate the different types of citizen participation programs as this was an essential aspect of advisory council activity.

Hamer (1977), with regard to the 'rubber stamp' mode of participation, stated that advisory councils were rubber stamps or "mouthpieces for school administrators" (p. 16). He felt that most councils were viewed as unrepresentative of the community and suggested that this

situation could be reversed by the recruitment and inclusion of a wide cross-section of council candidates.

Pharis (1977) with regard to the instituting, evaluative, and implementation modes of participation, indicated that parent participation should include the planning, instituting, evaluating, and implementation phase of important educational decisions that affected them and their youngsters. Moreover, he suggested that parents wanted to make their own decisions and did not want to approve decisions already made by someone else.

Price (1977) with regard to the evaluative mode of participation, indicated that an advisory council must monitor its activities, or it may lose sight of its intended purpose. Moreover, he suggested that "a council must evaluate its own activities, as well as assist in evaluating the success of programs with which it is concerned" (p. 23). Further, "through periodic evaluation, councils can determine if its objectives, and that of programs are being met" (p. 24).

The Parent Advisory Council Information Handbook for Title I in Georgia (1977) with regard to the advisory and evaluative modes of participation, stated that "the council studies the evaluations of past Title I programs and advises the agencies on the evaluation of the present programs" (p. 11). Moreover, parents must have a knowledge of Title I programs and projects regarding "assessment of

student needs, evaluation of project effectiveness, target school selection and project design" (p. 10).

Mizell (1979) made a study of advisory councils and Title I programs and projects. With regard to the advisory, evaluative and implementation modes of participation, he pointed out that "advisory councils have a responsibility for advising local education agencies in planning for, and implementation and evaluation of Title I programs and projects..." (p. 10).

Andrews (1980) with regard to the collaborative or consultation mode stated that:

> with schools taking on an ever increasing responsibility for a wide variety of decisions, the need for consultation in the decision-making process has become more apparent in the quest to gain consent, commitment and legitimation for the decisions made. Paralleling this need has been the development of formal and informal decision-making structures to facilitate the consultation process (p. 5).

'Other factors' were involved which were not included in the seven potential propositions or modes of participation such as non-involvement, rubber stamp, instituting, collaborating, advising, authorizing, and evaluating. 'Other Factors' constituted a category in which infrequently occurring elements affecting decision-making might be included. Such additional factors might not indicate a high degree of participation and therefore might be thought of as representing a set of events not included among the seven major degrees of participation.

RELATED LITERATURE REGARDING ATTITUDES OF EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONALS AND NON-PROFESSIONALS CONCERNING THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

A review of the literature revealed that educational professionals and non-professional personnel differed with respect to their attitudes concerning community advisory councils. They also differed with respect to their perceptions concerning educational decision-making.

Kerlinger (1958) found that individuals having similar occupational roles would hold similar attitudes toward a cognitive object related to the roles. He also discovered that educational professionals could make sharp differentiations about complex educational matters while non-professional personnel exhibited a lesser degree of ego-involvement and educational differentiation. Moreover, the educational attitude-value field of non-professionals was inconsistently or badly structured.

Malles (1974) studied the role of the school-community council in educational decision-making in the Chicago Public Schools. He concluded that a larger number of non-professionals or parents (70 percent) believed that the council had improved the total educational program. However, less than 50 percent of the administrators and only 15 percent of the teachers felt this to be so. Malles also found that parents responded for greater ideal major influence levels for school-community councils in educa-

tional decision-making than did administrators or teachers. Moreover, 67 percent of the parents or non-professionals believed that the advisory council was representative of the local community as opposed to approximately 23 percent of the educational professionals including administrators and teachers who felt that the council was not representative of the local community.

Becerra (1974) identified perceptions held by community representatives including parents or non-professionals, and those of school administrators as educational professionals regarding each others' readiness and skills to be involved in participatory decision-making for affecting practices in education. Her major findings identified disparities in the perception of each others' ability to understand their role, to distinguish between decision-making and policy making, and their own ability in participatory decision-making. Further, school administrators perceived themselves as being more effective than the perceptions held for them in this area by community representatives.

Bereen (1976) studied the perceptions of parents and administrators toward real-ideal parent involvement in selected Westchester Catholic schools. She found that no real parent involvement in the decision-making process was taking place, and that principals were not actively seeking the participation of parents.

Capie (1977) undertook an attitudinal study of administrators and school board members in the State of New York. His investigation revealed that school board members as non-professionals, believed in significantly less involvement of teachers, parents and students in policy decisions than did chief school administrators, secondary school principals, and other central office administrators. School board members were also less likely to encourage teachers, parents, and students in making selected policy decisions than they would administrators and other educational professionals.

Several studies have indicated that on specific issues or points of view, educational professionals and non-professional personnel might share opinions, perceptions, and attitudes concerning educational decision-making and school-community advisory councils.

Woodward (1977) examined perceptions of secondary school principals as well as the perceptions of teachers and superintendents as educational professionals regarding principal decision-making and problem solving. The perceptions of parents, students, and the school board as non-professionals were also studied with respect to the role of the principal in decision-making and problem solving. He concluded that educational professionals and non-professionals wanted to be involved in making decisions and in problem resolution. They were supportive of the principal in this role when he involved them in the

decision-making process.

Nolin (1978) made a study of the perceptions of school administrators, teachers, parents, and school board members with regard to the roles of the elementary schools. He concluded that teachers and school administrators as educational professionals did not substantially differ from non-professionals personnel such as school board members, that citizens should not be involved in the selection of the school personnel.

Franse (1978) investigated the real-ideal participation of school-parent organizations in the decision-making process of governance activities as perceived by principals and parent organization presidents in the New York City school system. He concluded that principals were not exercising enough initiative and that school-parent organizations were not participating to the fullest extent in governance activities and the decision-making process.

Whetten (1979) attempted to assess the actual and ideally perceived role of the school-community advisory council in educational decision-making in 75 Texas school districts. Educational professionals such as school principals and community education directors, as well as non-professionals such as chairpersons of school-community advisory councils were utilized in this research. The three role groups all agreed that school-community advisory councils should be consulted to a greater degree in

educational decision-making, and that such councils should be important components of the general educational program.

Within the community of educational professionals, however, there is research to show that there were differences in perceptions and attitudes among administrators, teachers, and superintendents as educational professionals. One ought not to conceive of educational professionals as a monolithic entity with respect to attitudes toward educational decision-making and advisory councils.

Stiles (1972) sought opinions about educational programs, policies, personnel and educational needs in the Tacoma Public Schools. He investigated the relationships among educational decision-maker opinions, community opinions, and estimates of community opinions made by educational decision-makers. The findings revealed that the opinions of educational decision-makers as educational professionals were not reliably related to either their estimates of community opinions or actual community opinions.

Brickman (1974) attempted to determine the differences and similarities in value and progress perceptions of administrators, teachers, classified personnel, Parent Teacher Association members (P.T.A.) and School-Community Advisory Council members (S.C.A.C.) as related to advisory council participation in decision-making for the Los Angeles Unified School District. The researcher found that administrators as educational professionals were more homogenous when compared to other school based groups or non-profes-

sionals concerning the value and progress they attached to School-Community Advisory Councils' participation in decision-making. Teachers from different school sizes were also relatively homogenous regarding the value and progress they ascribed to advisory council participation in the decision-making process.

Paffenroth (1974) attempted to investigate the relationship between the expressed value of principals and teachers as educational professionals, their attitudes toward education, and their degree of participation in the decision-making process in their schools. His major conclusions were that teachers held less progressive attitudes toward education than did principals, and that teachers who participated in decision-making expressed higher levels of job satisfaction than did teachers who were not involved in the decision-making process. Moreover, principals held traditional values while teachers held more emergent values.

Similarly with respect to non-professionals, data existed that indicated that involved parent groups would have different opinions than non-involved parent groups or educational professionals with respect to the significance of the decisions made within their organizational groups.

Villars (1976) investigated school-community interactions in educational decision-making in several Colorado school districts. The study revealed that non-professionals such as school district advisory accountability committee members held the view that their efforts in improving the

quality of education in their school had greater value than did the efforts of advisory accountability committees from districts not involved in these processes. In short, a variation of role perception and accountability within the educational communities taken as a whole was apparent.

Schultz et al. (1980) made a study of teachers and advisory council members. He found that council members felt that their most common function was the development of goals and objectives, while teachers felt the main function of advisory councils was communication with the community. Moreover, council members as non-professionals tended to be more satisfied than teachers with advisory council functions, acceptance of council action, and council visibility.

SUMMARY

In summation, this chapter was divided into three sections: related literature regarding parental participation in the schools; related literature regarding accomplishments of parent advisory councils; and related literature regarding attitudes of educational professionals and non-professionals concerning the decision-making process.

A review of related literature strongly indicated that increased parent participation in the schools brought about improvement in pupils' cognitive and affective development. In addition, research on parental participation, especially in preschool education and early childhood programs, suggested that youngsters of involved parents

made greater cognitive gains, and continued to maintain this growth as they progressed through the grades.

District parent advisory council involvement and participation in educational decision-making for Title I programs and projects were significant factors in program effectiveness. The findings indicated that the academic achievement of Title I target youngsters was markedly improved in reading and mathematics as a result of council member intervention. Furthermore, the results proved conclusively the importance of home-school cooperation and interaction which were instrumental in improving pupil performance.

Educational professionals and non-professional personnel including parents differed with respect to their attitudes and perceptions concerning many crucial issues pertaining to school life. On specific issues or points of view, however, educational professionals and non-professional personnel opinions, perceptions and attitudes might be congruent.

Similarly, research indicated that there were differences in perceptions and attitudes within groups of educational professionals and non-professionals. The attitudes and opinions, however, within these two groups were not total, absolute, or monolithic. There was conclusive evidence that indicated that educational professionals and non-professionals wanted to participate in problem resolution and in decision-making, and that

these groups were supportive of the principal when he involved them in the decision-making process.

Studies in parental participation tended to suggest that meaningful public intervention in the schools through such anti-poverty programs as Title I, Head Start, and Follow Through helped the educationally deprived youngsters to overcome academic deficiencies, and afforded parents of Title I target youngsters a voice in educational decision-making. Each program was designed as a vehicle for parent participation.

CHAPTER III

THE SUBJECTS, THE MATERIALS, AND THE PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the subjects who were employed in this study and who were involved in gathering the data for this research; the development of the materials employed in refining the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale; the general procedures utilized in selecting the research sample; the development of the instrument for content validity; the distribution of materials and collection of the data; and the statistical procedures used in the analysis, evaluation, and interpretation of the data. In short, this chapter was divided into three general areas: (1) The Subjects; (2) The Materials; and (3) The Procedures.

THE SUBJECTS

The population for this study consisted of all the district parent advisory council members, as well as all the district superintendents, community school board chairpersons, principals of Title I schools, teachers of Title I pupils, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards of seven school districts in the Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn in New York City. This population consisted of 175 district parent advisory council

members, seven district superintendents, 63 community school board members, 175 principals of Title I schools, 11,100 teachers of Title I pupils, 55,000 parents of Title I pupils, and ten chairpersons of community planning boards. This study did not include senior high schools.

The sample for this study specifically included ten district parent advisory council members, seven district superintendents, ten community school board chairpersons, 31 principals of Title I schools, 30 teachers of Title I pupils, 30 parents of Title I pupils, and ten chairpersons of community planning boards selected from seven school districts in the Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn in New York City. Responses were received from a total of 128 participating respondents of a possible 160, or approximately 80 to 85 percent of the total sample. The number of responses returned by the participating subjects were eight or 80 percent of the district parent advisory council members, seven or 100 percent of the district superintendents, eight or 80 percent of the community school board chairpersons, 28 or 90.32 percent of the principals of Title I schools, 24 or 83.33 percent of the teachers of Title I pupils, 23 or 76.66 percent of the parents of Title I pupils, and seven or 70 percent of the chairpersons of community planning boards.

Form letters from the New York City Board of Education's Office of Educational Evaluation were distributed to 33 district superintendents informing them of the conditions of the proposed study. Seven school superintendents and 31 principals of Title I schools expressed an interest in participating in the investigation. As a result, a total of 31 selected elementary, intermediate, and junior high schools from three school districts in the Bronx and four school districts in Brooklyn were involved in the research.

Steps were undertaken in the study to equalize the number of subjects who were educational professionals and an equal number who were non-professionals. As a result, one half of the respondents were selected from three Bronx districts and one half of them from four Brooklyn districts.

Numbers were not assigned individuals nor was a table of random numbers employed to select the sample. Instead, participating principals provided organization sheets, and every tenth name selected was included in the sample for this study.

THE MATERIALS

Development of the Personal Data Fact Sheet. Demographic information on district superintendents, principals of Title I schools, teachers of Title I pupils, district parent advisory council members, community school board chairpersons, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards was solicited through their direct responses on the Personal Data Fact Sheet accompanying the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale. Personal data were utilized to describe the subjects precisely and to collect information for the following variables: age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making.

THE PROCEDURES

The major procedures utilized in this study included: (1) the development of the problem; (2) the development of the instrument; (3) the primary role of the Panel of Experts in obtaining additional information about content validity, the refinement of the instrument and the clarification of the directions; (4) a Pilot Study to evaluate the instrument utilized in this study; (5) the collection of the data from the selected respondents; and (6) the utilization of statistical procedures used to analyze the collected data.

The scope and procedures of the study were determined with the assistance of Fordham University's Dissertation Seminar Committee in the Graduate Division of Administration, Policy, and Urban Education. The topic, the identification of the subjects, and the preliminary draft of the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale were reviewed by the disserataion seminar committee.

Development of the Problem. The interest of the researcher in district parent advisory council participation in educational decision-making emerged as a result of the decentralization of the New York City school system, and greater parent and community participation in the schools. The researcher also worked directly with parents of the school community and participated as a school representative in the activities of the District Parent Advisory Countil of District 10, the Bronx, in New York City. The interest in advisory councils also emanated as a result of professional readings, lectures, participation in and first hand knowledge of advisory councils as assistant principal of the New York City elementary school system.

Development of the Instrument. The researcher developed the instrument after a thorough review of related literature including United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and New York State Education Department data concerning Title I programs and projects as

well as the New York City Central Board of Education policy statement information with regard to guidelines and responsibilities for district advisory councils. Five activities and 45 items of the instrument were selected by the researcher. The five activities were: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation.

The scalar values included the following scale ranges and associated descriptors: (1) 1.0 to 1.5 - non-involvement; (2) 1.6 to 2.5 - rubber stamp; (3) 2.6 to 3.5 - instituting; (4) 3.6 to 4.5 - collaborating; (5) 4.6 to 5.5 - advising; (6) 5.6 to 6.5 - authorizing; and (7) 6.6 to 7.0 - evaluating. The category 'other' did not lie in the same continuum as did the preceding descriptors. Therefore, the scale terminated at 7.0.

Activity I, Educational Needs Assessments, contained nine items. The items dealt primarily with the identification and selection of Title I target youngsters in target attendance areas, and whether advisory councils worked closely with and made use of the findings and recommendations made by school and district-unit personnel. These questions were developed from various New York City Board of Education circulars and publications entitled

"Guidelines for Advisory Councils-Local (Community District) and Central" (1978); "Advisory Councils: Partnerships that Work" (1978); and "A Compendium of E.S.E.A. Title I Programs" (1978).

Activity II, Project Selection, contained nine items. The items dealt primarily with defining program and project goals, providing for long and short-term objectives, establishing priorities for programs and projects, and approving Title I programs and projects. These questions were originally developed from various New York City Board of Education circulars and publications entitled: "Guidelines for Advisory Councils-Local (Community District) and Central" (1971); "Handbook of California School District Advisory Committees" Reyes, et al. (1976); "The Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act" (1965); and "A Handbook of Title I Applications: How to Read Them: How to Shape Them" (1976).

Activity III, Collaborative Planning, contained nine items. The items dealt primarily with advisory council members consultations with district superintendents and community school board members regarding Title I programs and projects by means of meetings, flyers, newsletters and brochures, and the establishment of in-service courses, workshops, and other training components for district advisory council members. These questions were

developed from various New York City Board of Education Circulars and publications entitled: "Guidelines for Advisory Councils-Local (Community District) and Central" (1971); "Handbook of California School District Advisory Committees" Reyes et al. (1976); and "The Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act" (1965).

Activity IV Financial Management of Reimbursables, contained nine items. The items dealt primarily with the planning and distribution of Title I funds and Impact Aid allocations to public and non-public Title I programs and projects. These questions were developed from various New York City Board of Education circulars and publications entitled: "A Compendium of E.S.E.A. Title I Programs" (1978); and "Guidelines for Advisory Councils-Local (Community District) and Central" (1971).

Activity V, Program Evaluation and Implementation, contained nine items. The items dealt primarily with the distribution of minutes of advisory council meetings to the wider community, the extent of advisory council evaluation of Title I programs, projects, and educational materials, the relationship of advisory council decisions and determinations with regard to pupil academic achievement, pupil attitudes toward school, parent attitudes toward education, and the implementation of Title I programs and projects by advisory council members. These questions were developed

from various New York City Board of Education circulars and publications entitled: "A Compendium of E.S.E.A. Title I Programs" (1978); "Guidelines for Advisory Councils-Local (Community District) and Central" (1971); "Parent and Community Participation in Compensatory Education Through District Advisory Committees in California: A Progress Report" Gezi and Reyes (1971); and "A Handbook on Title I Application: How to Read Them: How to Shape Them" (1976).

Panel of Experts. The primary purpose of the panel of experts was to gather added information about content validity. The panel was further utilized to clarify the directions and to refine the instrument. An evaluation form was distributed to each expert who was asked to: (1) determine the relevance of each item in the instrument to the category in which it was included; (2) determine the clarity of each statement; (3) determine the clarity of the general directions; (4) make suggestions regarding the format of the instrument; and (5) suggest any additional recommendations with regard to refining or revising the research instrument.

The panel of experts comprised eight members. (The names of the members of the panel utilized for this study were listed in Appendix B.) The panel was composed of three university professors in the area of Educational Administration and Supervision, the presidents of the

Institute for Responsive Education, the Public Education Association, Advocates for Children of New York Incorporated, a bilingual-bicultural teacher of the New York City public school system, and the chairperson of the Department of Modern Languages at Bronx Community College in the City of New York.

The recommendations of the panel were: (1) that direction three of the instrument be simplified and reworded to read 'Instituting'. The district parent advisory council is responsible for initiating action concerning a Title I program or project; (2) that several item statements in Parts I, III, and IV be reworded for clarity. For example, in Part I Educational Needs Assessments item statement 6 should read, 'council members utilize needs assessments information based upon district unit level personnel findings and recommendations', item statement 7 should read, 'council members utilize needs assessments information based upon school principal findings and recommendations', item statement 8 should read, 'council members utilize needs assessments information based upon teacher findings and recommendations', and item statement 9 should read, 'council members utilize needs assessments information based upon New York City Board of Education statistical test data'; in Part III Collaborative Planning, item statement 22 should read, 'council members work with

parents of Title I pupils in planning and providing for Title I compensatory education programs in the school district,' in Part IV Financial Management of Reimbursables, item statement 28 should read, 'council members are involved in planning for the 'carry over' of Title I funds to maintain the same high quality services for the following school year,' (3) that some items be deleted as the instrument was a lengthy one such as item statement 10, 'council members helped to identify educationally deprived children in eligible attendance areas,' item statement 11, 'council members help to determine the special needs of Title I target youngsters so as to develop high quality Title I programs and projects,' item statement 12, 'council members help select persons interested in working with Title I programs and projects,' item statement 16, 'council members engage in establishing priorities for Title I programs,' item statement 21, 'council members help select Title I guidance services for Title I target youngsters,' item statement 24, 'council members help select Title I Special Education Instruction for Title I target youngsters,' item statement 28, 'council members meet with parents at large of Title I pupils in planning and providing for Title I compensatory education programs in the school district,' item statement 34, 'council members assist the district-unit level administrative personnel in sending informative

letters, flyers, brochures, notices, regarding on-going Title I programs to parents at large of Title I pupils', item statement 35, 'minutes of council meetings are disseminated to all council members', item statement 36, 'minutes of council meetings are disseminated to the community at large with council members and district superintendent support', item statement 42, 'council members are involved in planning monies for the Division of Community School District Affairs' Guggenheim Museum's 'Learning to Read Through the Arts', item statement 43, 'council members are involved in planning monies for the Division of Educational Planning and Support's 'Children's Art Carnival', item statement 47, 'council members are involved in planning for how the non-public school community receives Title I monies', item statement 54, 'council members help evaluate Title I programs each year to ascertain whether or not educational goals and objectives are being met', item statement 58, 'council members educational decisions in Title I programs are effective in improving pupil motivation', and item statement 60, 'council members are engaged in implementing Title I programs through formal visits to Title I target schools; and (4) that the Spanish edition of the questionnaire be checked for errors in grammar. After careful study and review, the suggestions and recommendations of the panel

of experts were implemented, and the research instrument was further revised and refined.

Pilot Study. The pilot study was the means by which the responses of the trial instrument could be assessed for a small group who would be representative of the population of the main study. An investigation of these responses supplied information concerning the adequacy and appropriateness of the procedures for the main study. Further objectives of the pilot study included: (1) to detect the subjects' difficulties in responding to the initial instrument; (2) to gather suggestions and recommendations for refinements; and (3) to ascertain the length of time it would take to complete the questionnaire items.

The members of the pilot group were chosen from a school district in the Borough of the Bronx in New York City. This school district was chosen because the schools were comparable to the schools of selected areas in the New York City Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn that had been chosen for the main study. Specifically, five district advisory council members, one district superintendent, three community school board members, five principals of Title I schools, ten teachers of Title I pupils, ten parents of Title I pupils, and one chairperson of the community planning board were mailed the instruments.

Included for the convenience of the respondents was a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Eighty-three percent of the respondents returned the questionnaire within three weeks. Telephone reminders increased the total number of questionnaires to 96 percent of the selected pilot group. The respondents answered every item statement, and reported that the statements were clear and concise. A preliminary review and analysis of the questionnaires indicated that parents of Title I pupils and district parent advisory council members shared very similar views. Further, the teachers of Title I pupils differed widely in their responses with regard to district parent advisory council participation in educational decision-making as compared to the principals of Title I pupils and the district superintendents. All respondents indicated that it took about 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Collection of the Data. The instrument, District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale, was mailed to the ten district parent advisory council members, seven district superintendents, ten community school board chairpersons, 31 principals of Title I schools, 30 teachers of Title I pupils, 30 parents of Title I pupils and ten chairpersons of community planning boards selected from a complete listing of seven district superintendents, 175 district parent advisory council members, 63 members

of community school boards, 175 principals of Title I schools, 11,100 teachers of Title I pupils, 55,000 parents of Title I pupils, and ten chairpersons of community planning boards in selected elementary, intermediate, and junior high schools in seven school districts in the Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn in New York City. An explanatory letter together with a coded, stamped, self-addressed envelope accompanied the instrument. The coded envelope was used to protect the respondents or districts from the possibility of being identified and stereotyped, as well as for the purpose of maximizing the level of sample responses. Approximately 65 percent of the respondents returned the questionnaire within three weeks after the initial mailing on January 4, 1980. A follow-up letter was sent to all participants on February 4, 1980, who had not responded to the first letter. As a result, approximately 73 percent of the respondents returned the questionnaire. On March 4, 1980, follow-up telephone calls were made to district superintendents, district advisory council members, chairpersons of community school boards, principals of Title I schools, teachers of Title I pupils, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards who had not responded. The returns received amounted to approximately 79 percent. On April 4, 1980, a second round of follow-up telephone calls were made to

those respondents who still had not returned the questionnaire. By April 30, 1980, the total number of responses by the participating subjects were seven or 100 percent of the district superintendents, 28 or 90.32 percent of the principals of Title I schools, 24 or 83.33 percent of the teachers of Title I pupils, eight or 80 percent of the district parent advisory council members, eight or 80 percent of the community school board chairpersons, and seven or 70 percent of the chairpersons of community planning boards, and 18 or 60 percent of the parents of Title I pupils. Questionnaire distribution continued until data was gathered on a total of 128 subjects. Although totally accurate records of questionnaire distributions were not maintained, a reasonable estimate of the final rate of response was approximately 80 to 85 percent.

Statistical Procedures. The data obtained from the instruments returned by the respondents were analyzed in the following manner:

1. The questionnaire included 45 questions which respondents rated on a seven point scale of involvement in which 'non-involvement' represented the low end of the scale and a value of one, while 'evaluating' represented the maximum level of participation and a value of seven. One other response option entitled 'other factors' was included in the questionnaire in order to permit respondents

a place to indicate additional but irrelevant factors. 'Other factors' included lack of participation in advisory councils and lack of knowledge concerning advisory councils. Generally speaking, it is a good practice to permit respondents to indicate a category that is not along the dimension one wishes to investigate in order to determine whether or not the investigated dimension is responded to as the major dimension of interest. Responses to 'other factors' were not included in the analyses of these data. In order to determine the reliability of these date, the SPSS Reliability Program was used on a sample of 128 subjects having complete data including age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making. Cronbach's alpha was calculated to be .94 using the SPSS Reliability analysis applied to 128 cases.

2. The means and standard deviations for each of the 45 items in the questionnaire were computed for the educational professionals and non-professional personnel. Further, the means for each of the five activities were computed for educational professionals and non-professional personnel.

3. To determine whether significant differences existed between the means of educational professionals and non-professional personnel with respect to the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects, a t test for independent samples was

used to test the significance of the difference between two means (Table III).

To determine whether there were significant differences within the responses of educational professionals to each of the five activities, treatment by-subjects, repeated measure analysis of variance for correlated groups was used. Scheffe's test was used when the F ratio was significant to detect the location of significant differences. The data were analyzed five at a time because there were five activity categories.

To determine whether there were significant differences within the responses of non-professional personnel to each of the five activities, treatment by-subjects, repeated measure analysis of variance for correlated groups was used. Scheffe's test was used when the F ratio was significant to detect the location of significant differences.

4. To determine whether significant relationships existed between the responses of educational professionals and non-professional personnel with regard to the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects, specific procedures were undertaken (Tables V,VI).For each individual, the mean rating for each of the five activities was calculated. A data set was

constructed consisting of each individual's age, gender dummy coded, years of experience in educational decision-making and their mean rating for each of the five decision-making areas. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated between each of the demographic variables and each of the dependent variables. The dependent variables utilized in this study were educational needs assessments, project selection, collaborative planning, financial management of reimbursables, and program evaluation and implementation.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences descriptive statistics and one-way frequency distributions were employed to determine the basic distributional characteristics of each of the variables in the present investigation. The SPSS subprogram T-Test when applied to the means of independent samples from populations with unequal variances employs a statistic which is an approximation of the standard t test, since student's t could not be calculated when populations have unequal variances. The t statistic employs a formula for calculating the degrees of freedom such that decimal values occur (Nie, et al. 1975, pp. 249-274).

The one-way analysis of variance for repeated measures program was the SPSS. Scheffe's test of the significance of the differences between means was applied

only after a significant F ratio was obtained in the major analysis. Scheffe's test was selected because it reduces the probability of a Type I error (Bruning et al., 1977 and Huck et al. 1974). The SPSS program PEARSON CORR was employed to compute the Pearson product moment correlation co-efficients. In all analyses, the maximum number of subjects having complete data were used. This procedure resulted in varying numbers of subjects in each of the statistical tests performed. Therefore, as can be seen by inspection of the numbers of subjects in the tables appended, there is variation. Although this placed an additional burden on the interpretation of the data, it was believed that the increase in information obtained by using the maximum number of subjects per comparison justified these procedures. It is always easier to interpret data when the number of each statistical analysis is equal. Since that was not the case in the present investigation, the present researcher had to take into consideration the fact that greater confidence could be placed in those data based upon larger numbers of subjects.

The minimal statistical level of significance premitted by this study was .05, except in the case of the Scheffe's test in which alpha was set at .10 in order to compensate for the exceptionally conservative

character of the test. All computations were calculated on a Sigma VII computer and auxiliary data processing equipment at Queens College, City University of New York.

CHAPTER IV

THE FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter was to report the major findings developed from an analysis of the data obtained from the instrument District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale. This instrument was utilized to determine the perceptions of educational professionals including district superintendents, principals of Title I schools and teachers of Title I pupils as well as non-professional personnel including district parent advisory council members, community school board chairpersons, parents of Title I pupils and chairpersons of community planning boards in selected New York City schools with regard to the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects relative to five decision-making activities. The activities included educational needs assessments, project selection, collaborative planning, financial management of reimbursables, and program evaluation and implementation. The study also investigated relationships between the perceptions of educational professionals such as district superintendents, principals of Title I schools and teachers of Title I pupils as well as non-professional personnel such as district parent advisory council members, community school board chair-

persons, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards in selected New York City schools with regard to the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects, and the variables of age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making.

DISTRIBUTIONS OF THE RESPONSES OF PERSONNEL WITH REGARD TO PARTICIPATION OF DISTRICT PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS IN DECISION-MAKING OF TITLE I E.S.E.A. PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS

The purpose of this section was to present the distributions of responses of educational professionals and non-professionals with regard to the perceived degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects in each of the five decision-making activities: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation.

Analysis of the data concerned with the distributions of responses used the following scale ranges and associated descriptors: (1) 1.0 to 1.5 - non-involvement; (2) 1.6 to 2.5 - rubber stamp; (3) 2.6 to 3.5 - instituting; (4) 3.6 to 4.5 - collaborating; (5) 4.6 to 5.5 - advising; (6) 5.6 to 6.5 - authorizing; and (7) 6.6 to 7.0 - evaluating. The category 'other' did not lie in the same continuum as

did the preceding descriptors. Therefore, the scale terminated at 7.0.

The numbers of respondents in each of the two groups and the total groups are listed by each item and each response value ranging from one through N.R. or No Response. The means and standard deviations were calculated only on the scalar values one through seven. Response number eight, 'other factors,' was included in the instrument in order for subjects to indicate additional but irrelevant factors. The term 'no response' means the item was omitted by a respondent. Other factors and no response were not included in the calculations of the means and standard deviations.

Of the 45 items on the scale for educational professionals, none were rated between 1.0 and 1.5 for scale value one. For scale value two, 2 were rated between 1.6 and 2.5. For scale value three, 26 were rated between 2.6 and 3.5. For scale value four, 17 were rated between 3.6 and 4.5. For scale value five, none were rated between 4.6 and 5.5. For scale value six, none were rated between 5.6 and 6.5. For scale value seven, none were rated between 6.6 and 7.0.

The majority of educational professionals on the 45 items fell within the category of 'instituting.' The next most frequently checked category was 'collaborating.'

Of the 45 items on the scale for non-professional personnel, none were rated between 1.0 and 1.5 for scale

Value one. For scale value two, none were rated between 1.6 and 2.5 For scale value three, 29 were rated between 2.6 and 3.5. For scale value four, 16 were rated between 3.6 and 4.5. For scale value five, none were rated between 4.6 and 5.5. For scale value six, none were rated between 5.6 and 6.5. For scale value seven, none were rated between 6.6 and 7.0.

The majority of non-professional personnel on the 45 items fell within the category of 'instituting.' The next most frequently checked category was 'collaborating.' The last category checked by non-professional personnel was 'advising.'

The majority of educational professionals responding to Activity I, Educational Needs Assessments, fell between scale values one through five for all nine items. The same pattern of distribution was obtained for educational non-professionals.

The most frequently assigned scale value for Educational Needs Assessments was four for educational professionals, constituting 27.9 percent of all the values assigned. Scale value four represented the category 'collaborating.' Educational professionals responded as if they believed they were being consulted by district administrators in educational decision-making. One might assume that as a result, educational professionals could make better quality decisions and cooperate more fully in their implementation. Educational non-professionals

responded similarly.

The majority of educational professionals responding to Activity II, Project Selection, fell between scale values one through five for all nine items. The same pattern of distribution was obtained for educational non-professionals for this activity.

The most frequently assigned scale value for Project Selection was four for educational professionals, constituting 23.5 percent of all the values assigned. Scale value four represented the category 'collaborating.' Educational professionals responded as if they believed they were being consulted by district administrators in educational decision-making and, as a result, had a better working relationship with members of the school district administrative staff. Educational non-professionals responded similarly.

The majority of educational professionals responding to Activity III, Collaborative Planning, fell between scale values one through five for all nine items. The same pattern of distribution was obtained for educational non-professionals for this activity.

The most frequently assigned scale value for Collaborative Planning was four for educational professionals, constituting 33.3 percent of all the values assigned. Scale value four represented the category 'collaborating.' Educational professionals responded as if they believed they were being encouraged by district

administrators by being given greater input and opportunities to participate actively in educational decision-making for Title I programs and projects. Educational non-professionals responded similarly.

The majority of educational professionals responding to Activity IV, Financial Management of Reimbursables, fell between scale values one through five for all nine items. The same pattern of distribution was obtained for educational non-professionals for this activity.

The most frequently assigned scale value for Financial Management of Reimbursables was one for educational professionals, constituting 31.7 percent of all values assigned. Scale value one represented the category 'non-involvement.' Educational professionals responded as if they believed they were not participating in budget, funding and financing activities associated with educational decision-making and Title I programs and projects. Educational non-professionals responded similarly.

The majority of educational professionals responding to Activity V, Program Evaluation and Implementation, fell between scale values one through five for all nine items. The same pattern of distribution was obtained for educational non-professionals for this activity.

The most frequently assigned scale value for Program Evaluation and Implementation was four for

educational professionals, constituting 27.1 percent of all the values assigned. Scale value four represented the category 'collaborating.' Educational professionals responded as if they believed they were being consulted in the decision-making process, and given opportunities to make choices regarding Title I programs and projects. Educational non-professionals responded similarly.

The percentages for each item by response category may be found in Table II. Discussion has been reserved for those analyses in which statistical tests of an inferential nature have been applied.

COMPARISONS AMONG AND BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONALS AND NON-PROFESSIONALS REGARDING PARTICIPATION OF ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBER ACTIVITIES

The purpose of this section was to answer the following questions presented in the statement of the problem (p. 10), namely: (2) Did significant differences exist among the means of the responses of educational professionals relative to the five decision-making activities? (3) Did significant differences exist among the means of the responses of non-professional personnel relative to the five decision-making activities? (4) Did significiant differences exist between the means of the responses of educational professionals and non-professional personnel with respect to the five decision-making activities?

The data concerned with the means of responses of educational professionals to each of the five decision-making activities were presented in Table IV (Appendix E). A one-way analysis of variance for repeated measures performed yielded a significant F ratio ($F_{4,268}$=7.794). The data were presented in Table IV (Appendix E). Scheffe's multiple comparison test applied to the data of hypothesis (2) revealed that there were significant differences among educational professionals' mean ratings of district parent advisory council participation such that the mean ratings of educational needs assessments, project selection, collaborative planning, and program selection and implementation were all greater than the mean for financial management of reimbursables and were presented in Table IV (Appendix E).

The data concerned with the means of responses of non-professional personnel to each of the five decision-making activities were presented in Table IV (Appendix E). A one-way analysis of variance for repeated measures performed upon the data for all non-professional personnel having complete data yielded a significant F ratio ($F_{4,236}$=2.524). The data were presented in Table IV (Appendix E). Scheffe's multiple comparison test applied to the data of hypothesis (3) revealed that there were significant differences among non-professional personnel mean ratings of district parent advisory council participa-

tion such that the mean rating for project selection was greater than the mean for financial management of reimbursables and were presented in Table IV (Appendix E).

The data concerned with the responses of educational professionals and non-professional personnel to each of the five decision-making activities were presented in Table III (Appendix E). There were no statistically significant differences between the means of the two groups on any of the five decision-making activities. The data were presented in Table III (Appendix E). The means for all the decision-making activities indicated that both educational professionals and non-professionals perceived the functioning of advisory councils at the level of 'instituting' and were presented in Table II (Appendix E). However, the majority of the responses of the participants on the table of distributions fell within the category of 'collaborating' and were presented in Table II (Appendix E).

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONALS' RESPONSES REGARDING PARTICIPATION OF COUNCIL MEMBERS IN TITLE I AND AGE, SEX, AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATIONAL DECISION-MAKING

The purpose of this section was to answer the following questions presented in the statement of the problem (p. 10), namely: (5) Did significant relationships exist between the responses of educational professionals with regard to the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects relative to

the five decision-making activities: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation and the variables of age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making?

The data concerned with the relationships between the responses of educational professionals relative to each of the five decision-making activities of Title I programs and projects and age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making were presented in Table V (Appendix E).

Pearson's product moment coefficient of correlation between the variables of age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making and the ratings of the five decision-making activities did not yield any statistically significant relationships. Age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making were not significantly associated with respondents' perceptions concerning decision-making activities.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN NON-PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL RESPONSES REGARDING PARTICIPATION OF COUNCIL MEMBERS IN TITLE I AND AGE, SEX, AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATIONAL DECISION-MAKING

The purpose of this section was to answer the following question presented in the statement of the problem, (p. 11), namely: (5) Did significant relationships exist between the responses of non-professional personnel with

regard to the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects relative to the five decision-making activities: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation and the variables of age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making?

The data concerned with the relationships between the responses of non-professional personnel relative to each of the five decision-making activities of Title I programs and projects and age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making were presented in Table VI (Appendix E).

Pearson's product moment coefficient of correlation between the variables of age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making and the ratings of the five decision-making activiites did not yield any statistically significant relationships. Age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making were not signficantly associated with respondents' perceptions concerning decision-making activities.

CHAPTER V

THE SUMMARY, THE CONCLUSIONS, AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS

A summary of this study, including the findings, were reported in this chapter. The conclusions drawn from this investigation, the recommendations based upon the findings, and suggestions for further research also were reported.

THE SUMMARY

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine and compare the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects relative to: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation as perceived by educational professionals such as district superintendents, principals of Title I schools, and teachers of Title I pupils, in comparison with non-professional personnel such as district parent advisory council members, community school board chairpersons, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards in selected New York City elementary schools, intermediate schools and junior high schools by means of

the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale designed by the researcher.

Moreover, this study sought to determine relationships between the perceptions of educational professionals such as district parent advisory council members, community school board chairpersons, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards in selected New York City elementary schools, intermediate schools, and junior high schools with regard to the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects, and the variables of age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making.

Specifically, the study proposed to answer the following questions:

1. What were the distributions of the responses of educational professionals in comparison with non-professional personnel with regard to the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects in the following decision-making activities: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation.

2. Did significant differences exist among the means of the responses of educational professionals

relative to the five decision-making activities? The question of interest here concerned whether or not educational professionals rated decision-making activities equally with respect to the degree of participation of district parent advisory councils.

3. Did significant differences exist among the means of the responses of non-professional personnel relative to the five decision-making activities? The question of interest here concerned whether or not non-professional personnel rated decision-making activities equally with respect to the degree of participation of district parent advisory councils.

4. Did significant differences exist between the means of the responses of educational professionals and non-professional personnel with respect to the five decision-making activities?

5. Did significant relationships exist between the responses of educational professionals and the responses of non-professional personnel with regard to the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects relative to the five decision-making activities: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation and each of the variables of age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making?

Design of the Study

The sample for the study included 128 district superintendents, principals of Title I schools, teachers of Title I pupils, district parent advisory council members, community school board chairpersons, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards. Specifically, seven district superintendents, 31 principals of Title I schools, 30 teachers of Title I pupils, ten district parent advisory council members, ten community school board chairpersons, 30 parents of Title I pupils, and ten chairpersons of community planning boards responded to the questionnaire.

The principal instrument used to collect data for this investigation was the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale. The instrument designed by the researcher was utilized to measure the perceptions of district superintendents, principals of Title I schools, teachers of Title I pupils, district parent advisory council members, community school board chairpersons, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards concerning the extent of participation of district parent advisory councils in educational decision-making of Title I programs and projects for New York City public schools.

The questionnaire consisted of 45 questions and five decision-making activities. Decision-making Activity I, Educational Needs Assessments, included nine items. The

items dealt primarily with the identification and selection of Title I target youngsters in target attendance areas, and whether advisory councils worked closely with and made use of the findings and recommendations made by school and district-unit personnel. Decision-making Activity II, Project Selection, included nine items. The items dealt primarily with defining program and project goals, providing for long and short-term objectives, establishing priorities for programs and projects and approving Title I programs and projects. Decision-making Activity III, Collaborative Planning, included nine items. The items dealt primarily with advisory council members' consultations with district superintendents and community school board members regarding Title I programs and projects by means of meetings, flyers, newsletters and brochures, and the establishment of in-service courses, workshops, and other training components for district advisory council members. Decision-making activity IV, Financial Management of Reimbursables, included nine items. The items dealt primarily with the planning and distribution of Title I funds and Impact Aid allocations to public and non-public Title I programs and projects. Decision-making Activity V, Program Evaluation and Implementation, included nine items. The items dealt primarily with the distribution of minutes of advisory council meetings to the wider community, the extent of advisory council evaluation of Title I programs, projects and educational materials, the

relationship of advisory council decision and determinations with regard to pupil academic achievement, pupil attitudes toward school, parent attitudes toward education, and the implementation of Title I programs and projects by advisory council members. A seven point scale of degree of involvement included the following scale ranges and associated descriptors: (1) 1.0 to 1.5 - non-involvement; (2) 1.6 to 2.5 - rubber stamp; (3) 2.6 to 3.5 - instituting; (4) 3.6 to 4.5 - collaborating; (5) 4.6 to 5.5 - advising; (6) 5.6 to 6.5 - authorizing; and (7) 6.6 to 7.0 - evaluating. The category, 'other,' did not lie in the same continuum as did the preceding descriptors. Therefore, the scale terminated at 7.0.

Demographic information about district superintendents, principals of Title I schools, teachers of Title I pupils, district parent advisory council members, community school board chairpersons, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards was solicited through the responses of the Personal Data Fact Sheet accompanying the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale. Personal data was utilized to describe the subjects precisely and to collect information for the following variables: age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making.

The collection of the data utilizing the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale was initiated on January 4, 1980, and was completed by April 30,

1980, with a total of 128 returns or approximately 80 to 85 percent of the sample.

Findings of the Study

The following were the major findings of this study:

1. Analysis of the data concerned with the distributions of percentages, means and standard deviations of educational professionals and non-professional personnel to each of the 45 items in the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale were described and reported in Chapter IV. Because the numbers of the subjects within these subgroups were too small to permit meaningful statistical comparisons, no inferences may be drawn from this purely descriptive statistical material.

2. Analysis of the data concerned with the comparison of mean responses of educational professionals indicated that the decision-making activities of educational needs assessments, project selection, collaborative planning, and program evaluation and implementation were all rated significantly higher than the rating assigned to the category of financial management of reimbursables.

3. Analysis of the data concerned with the comparison of mean responses of non-professional personnel indicated that a significant difference was found among the mean responses of non-professional personnel who rated project selection higher than the mean for financial management of reimbursables.

4. Analysis of the data concerned with the comparison of mean responses of educational professionals and non-professional personnel indicated no significant differences between the mean responses of educational professionals and non-professional personnel.

5. Analysis of the data concerned with the relationships of mean responses between educational professionals and non-professional personnel indicated that no significant relationships were found to exist between the responses of educational professionals and non-professionals' ratings of the five decision-making activities and the variables of age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making.

THE CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the findings of this study concerning educational professionals and non-professional personnel perceptions of the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I programs and projects relative to the five decision-making activities, the following conclusions appear justified:

1. Significant differences were found among the means of the responses of educational professionals and among the means of the responses of non-professionals. Both groups perceived financial management of reimbursables as a decision-making

area in which there was the least participation. However, no significant difference was found when professional and non-professional views were contrasted.

One may conclude from these results that there is a uniformity of views for educational professionals and non-professionals such that the least active decision-making area is perceived to be that of 'financial management of reimbursables.' This finding may reflect the fact that basic decision-making in this domain has characteristically been made at a higher administrative level than that of the parent advisory councils despite the legal mandate which gives legitimacy to the councils' claim to authority in this area.

2. There were no significant differences between the perceived decision-making activities of educational professionals and non-professional personnel in the present investigation. This is in contrast to data from other investigators. A number of researchers including Malles (1974) and Capie (1977), in investigations along lines of inquiry similar to the present investigation but not identical to it, found significant differences between educational professionals and non-professionals in a variety of activities concerned with roles and functions of teachers and administrators and the practice of parent advisory committees.

3. There were no significant relationships between the responses of educational professionals and non-profes-

sionals' ratings of the five decision-making activities and the variables of age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were based on the results, interpretation, and conclusions of this study:

1. Since no differences were noted between the perceptions of educational professionals and non-professional personnel, one might ask the question: Do professional and non-professional attitudes toward the district advisory councils become more similar the longer and closer the two groups work with each other? Kerlinger (1958) demonstrated a positive relationship between the variables of consistency in educational attitudes, experience, and contact with education. Further research along these lines may provide a deeper understanding of both the manner and content of educational attitudes.

2. As an extension of the findings of the present investigation, further study ought to be made of the importance of educational needs assessments, project selection, collaborative planning, financial management of reimbursables, and program evaluation and implementation among both professionals and non-professionals. In the opinion of this researcher, it would seem reasonable to expect that one of the reasons that an aspect of council functioning might be rated similarly by different groups is

simply that there are similarities in how important various functions are to the two groups. Similarities in the perceived importance of these areas may possibly be a factor in the rating a respondent gives to the degree of participation of district parent advisory councils within the above mentioned five decision-making areas.

3. A further extension of the work begun by the present investigation would do well to include the respondents' rating of the quality of decision-making as well as the degree of participation of district parent advisory councils in Title I programs and projects. Of particular interest would be the correlation of the quality of decision-making rating with the variable of degree of participation among professionals and non-professionals analyzed separately. In this researcher's view there ought to be a clear distinction between the extent to which a group participates in decision-making and the evaluation one makes concerning the effectiveness of such decision-making. One cannot be sure in the present analysis whether the respondents are, in fact, making the above distinction. Further research ought to be conducted along these lines. The question of interest would determine whether professionals or non-professionals made more clear-cut distinctions between the degree of participation and the quality of decision-making.

4. Based upon the data of this investigation, further study should be made of those respondents who

systematically perceived the district parent advisory councils' basic mode of participation as being that of a rubber stamp. It is to be expected that some respondents, be they principals, teachers, parents, or community school board members, would for some items in some decision-making activities at least once rate parent advisory council participation as being essentially a rubber stamp. A visual inspection of the instruments returned revealed this fact. In this investigator's opinion, it would seem that a respondent who systematically views the district parent advisory council as being a rubber stamp is an individual who is quite disaffected. The reasons for this perception are worthy of investigation in order to determine both the legitimacy of such an evaluation as well as the accuracy of the perception.

5. Based upon the observation of a slow response rate among parents of Title I pupils, it is recommended that an educational program be instituted with the aim of acquainting parents of Title I pupils with the importance and functions of district parent advisory councils and Title I programs.

6. A study should be made of the reasons for varying rates of response from the subgroups of professional and non-professional respondents. Principals responded 90.33 percent of the time, teachers responded 83.33 percent of the time, district superintendents responded 100 percent of the time, district parent advisory council members

responded 80 percent of the time, community school board chairpersons responded 80 percent of the time, parents responded 60 percent of the time, and the chairpersons of community planning boards responded 70 percent of the time. The reasons for these varying rates of response are unclear. It is recommended that further research be undertaken to determine the reasons why.

Some groups responded more than others. Procedures may be designed and implemented such that information concerning procedures and responsibilities of district parent advisory councils can be communicated to educational professionals and non-professional personnel involved in education. Informed decision-making is critically dependent upon a secure base of information. In this researcher's opinion, one important reason why different rates of response were obtained from different groups may be that the functions of district parent advisory councils were perceived as more important by some groups than others, thus eliciting different rates of response.

7. One potentially fruitful avenue for further research may be to investigate the relationship between aspects of school performance, and the perceptions of professionals and non-professionals of the functioning of district parent advisory councils. For example, indicants of school performance such as reading scores, mathematics scores, and related achievement data or perhaps teacher and pupil absences, teacher and pupil mobility rates, refer-

rals of pupils for disciplinary measures and so on, may be associated with respondents' evaluations of the effectiveness of the district parent advisory council's performance. Further investigation could reveal which, if any, of these school performance variables plays a part in shaping the responses of professionals' and non-professionals' evaluations of the functioning of the district parent advisory council.

8. Kornhauser's (1959) hypothesis concerning the equality of power in a plurality of groups might be tested within the context of parent advisory committees. While the bifurcation of the advisory committee's membership in terms of professional and non-professional members is a start in this direction, it would be interesting to pursue further investigation of the extent to which more specifically defined groups perceive the extent to which power is shared within the parent advisory council. Structured interviews with respondents might elicit information that would help specify the reasons for the differences obtained.

9. The informal groups that have evolved within parent advisory councils should be investigated in order to test Bobbitt et al.'s (1974) hypothesis concerning the connective links between advisory committee members being based upon personality characteristics. The present investigation has studied the formal organization and dichotomized groups in terms of professionals versus non-professionals rather than individual personality character-

istics as was suggested by Bobbitt et al. (1974).

10. Bennis (1969) offered a theory that decision making was dependent upon the ability to make choices as a principal element in the manner in which an organization responded to change. The present investigation indicated that district parent advisory council members perceived the council as functioning at the level of 'instituting,' that is, the district parent advisory council was responsible for initiating action concerning a Title I program or project. Further research ought to be done to test the hypothesis that the degree of change within parent advisory councils is correlated with members' perceived ability to make choices.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, J. L. "Community Involvement: Everybody's Talking About It," National Elementary Principal, 52: 56-59, January, 1973.

Adkins, P. G. "Parent Involvement in the Classroom: Boon or Bane," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 8: 2: 4, Winter, 1975.

_____ and T. D. Ainsa. "An Early Stimulation Program for Visually Handicapped Infants and Toddlers," Education of the Visually Handicapped, 10: 75-79, Fall, 1978-79.

Andrews, G. "Structures for School-Community Based Decision Sharing," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 187 009 1980, pp. 5; 6.

_____. Interview with Alice Baum, Director, National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, U. S. Department of Education, April 19, 1982.

Becerra, G. V. "Role Perceptions of Administrators and Community Representatives in Participatory Decision Making." Dissertation Abstracts International, 34: 6887-7888, 1974.

Beckman, W. L. "Volunteers Help Science Come Alive," Science and Children, 17: 22-23, September, 1979.

Bennis, W. G., K. D. Benne and R. Chin. Planned Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Berreen, V. F. "Administrators' and Parents' Perceptions of Real and Ideal Parental Involvement in Selected Catholic Westchester and Putnam Elementary Schools of the Archdiocese of New York," Unpublished Dissertation, Ph.D., Fordham University, 1976.

Bertalanffy, L. Von. "The History and Status of General Systems Theory," Academy of Management Journal, 15: 417, 1972.

Berube, M. R. "Achievement and Community Control," In Sexton, P. D. (Ed.) School Policy and Issues in a Changing Society. Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Blau, P. M. Bureaucracy in Modern Society. New York: Random House, 1966.

_____ and W. R. Scott. Formal Organizations. San Francisco, Calif.: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962, pp. 5; 35.

Bobbitt, H. R., Jr., R. H. Breinholt, R. H. Doktor, and J. P. McNaul. Organizational Behavior: Understanding and Prediction. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974, pp. 112; 114; 146.

Borg, W. R. and M. D. Gall. Educational Research: An Introduction. Second Edition. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1971.

_____. Interview with Richard Borell, Executive Assistant of the Office of Funded Programs, New York City Board of Education, March 25, 1982.

Boutsell, W. "More About Parent Participation," PTA Magazine, 63: 14-15, March, 1969.

_____. "Three Way Communication: Administrators, Teachers, and Parents Need to Talk," PTA Magazine, 75: 10-12, 1971.

Brickman, S. "Group Perception of School-Community Advisory Council Participation in Decision Making in the Los Angeles Unified School District," Dissertation Abstracts International, 35: 6355, March-April, 1974-1975.

Bruning, J. L. and B. L. Kintz. Computational Handbook of Statistics. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1977, pp. 125-127.

Bumbarger, C. S. "Differences in Teacher and Administrator Perceptions of Public School Decision Making: A Comparative Study in Selected Oregon School Districts," Dissertation Abstracts International, 27: 2765, 1966.

Capie, R. M. "A Study of the Attitudes and Opinions of Administrators and Board Members with Respect to the Involvement of Teachers, Parents, and Students in Decision Making," Dissertation Abstracts International, 38: 560-261, 1977.

Carpenter, C. C. "Principal Leadership and Parent Advisory Groups," Phi Delta Kappan, 56: 28; 426-427, February, 1975.

Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance. United States Office of Management and Budget. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1972, pp. 259-260.

Chap, L. L. Statistics: Methods and Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1974, pp. 266-271; 309-319.

Chapman, B. H. "An In-Depth Study of the Impact of the Parent Education Follow Through Program on Yakima, Washington." April, 1979, ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 168 718, April, 1979.

Child, J. "Organization Structure and Strategies of Control: A Replication of the Aston Studies," Administrative Science Quarterly, 17: 163-177, June, 1972.

Claiborne, C. "School Community Identification." Board of Education, City of Chicago, Illinois, 1981.

_____. "Institute for Parent Involvement." Board of Education, City of Chicago, Illinois, 1981.

Coburn, J. "A Community-Board Indian Curriculum Development Program," Educational Leadership, 34: 284-287, January, 1977.

Cohen, B. "Parent Involvement in Title I Evaluation," Research and Program Evaluation in the Behavioral Sciences, Spring, 1979.

"Commonwealth of Kentucky State Advisory Council for Vocational Education and Manpower Development and Training," Frankfort, Ky. ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 124 761, Dec. 1, 1975.

Community Planning Board 12 Bronx, N.Y. Descriptive Circular, 1980, pp. 1; 4.

Cook, T. E. and P. M. Morgan. Participatory Democracy. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1971.

Cordray, S. "Fail Safe." Independent School District at Houston, Texas, 1981.

Crenson, M. A. The Unpolitics of Air Pollution. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971, p. 179.

Cunningham, L. L. "Community Involvement in Change," Educational Leadership, 27: 363-366, January, 1970.

_____. "Crisis in School Organization," Educational Leadership, 26: 551-555, March, 1969.

_____. "Trends and Issues in Participation," Theory Into Practice, 82: 249-253, October, 1969.

_____ and H. T. James. Governing Schools: New Approaches to Old Issues. Columbus, Ohio: Charles W. Merrill Company, 1971.

Dahl, R. A. After the Revolution: Authority in a Good Society. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970, pp. 78; 153.

_____. Pluralist Democracy in the United States: Conflict and Consent. Chicago, Ill., Rand McNally and Company, 1967, pp. 10; 24.

_____. Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Davies, D. "Making Citizen Participation Work," Reprinted from National Elementary Principal, 55: 20-29, March-April, 1976.

_____, M. Clasby, R. Zerchykon, and B. Powers. "Patterns of Citizen Participation in Educational Decision Making," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 188 388, November, 1978, pp. 11-12; 34.

Deighton, L. C. (ed.) Encyclopedia of Education. New York: The Macmillan Company and Free Press, 1971.

Dill, W. R. "Decision Making," National Society for the Study of Education, 63rd Yearbook, 1964.

Drucker, P. F. The Effective Executive. New York: Harper and Row, 1966, pp. 148; 162.

Dubin, R. (ed.) Human Relations in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961, p. 140.

DuPree, T. J. "Brief History of Cherokee Schools: 1804-1976," Bureau of Indian Affairs, Albuquerque, New Mexico. ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 127 051, May, 1976.

Dye, T. R. Who's Running America? The Carter Years. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1979, pp. 9-10; 11-13; 34.

_____ and L. H. Zeigler. The Irony of Democracy: An Uncommon Introduction to American Politics.

North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press, 1978, pp. 7; 11.

Dyer, B. P. R. "Organizational Structure and Leadership Behavior of Directors in Selected Child Development Centers in New York City," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Fordham University, 1977.

Easton, A. Complex Managerial Decisions Involving Multiple Objectives. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973, pp. 84; 357-358.

"Education Amendments of 1978. An Act to Amend Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965," PL 95-561, p. 33.

Eels, D. R. "Are Parents Really Partners in Education?" NASSP Bulletin, 58: 26-31, January, 1974.

Einhaus, J. (ed.) "Getting the Community Into School Design," American School and University, 44: 28; 30; 32, April, 1972.

"Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I." ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 062 468, 1971.

Elliott D. "Project 88: Parent Participation in the Elementary School," Richmond Unified School District, California. August, 1972, p. 23.

Etzioni, A. "The Fallacy of Decentralization," The Nation, 209: 145-147, 1969.

Evans, D. R. "Responsive Educational Planning: Myth or Reality," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 180 064, January, 1977, p. 32.

Fantini, M. D. "Community Participation: Many Faces Many Directions," Educational Leadership, 29: 676-680, 1972.

_____ Participation, Decentralization, and Community Control," National Elementary Principal, 48: 26, 1969.

_____ and M. Gittell. Decentralization: Achieving Reform. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Farrell, M. C. "Identified Informal Faculty Groups as Supportive or Nonsupportive of Selected Decisions

and Operational Characteristics of the Formal Administrative School System," Unpublished Dissertation, Ph. D., Fordham University, 1972, p. 9

Federal Education Project. "A Handbook on Title I Applications: How to Read Them, How to Shape Them." Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. Washington, D. C., 1976.

_____. "A Handbook on Title I Applications: How to Read Them, How to Shape Them." Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. Washington, D.C.: July, 1979, p. 3.

Federal Education Project Newsletter. "United States Office of Education Issues Proposed Title I Regulations." Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. Washington, D. C.: July, 1979, pp. 1-2.

"Federal Register," Washington, D. C.: 36: 7827-7886, April, 1971.

Forte, E. J. "Benchmark Project, ESEA Title I," The School District of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1980.

Fox, D. J. The Research Process in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Franse, S. R. "Parent Participation in the Decision-Making Process of Governance Activities Under Decentralization," Unpublished Dissertation Ph. D., Fordham University, 1978, p. 20.

_____. Interview with Hattie Fredericks, Chairperson of the Citywide Advisory Council of New York City, March 22, 1982.

Gall, P. Desegregation: How Schools are Meeting Historic Challenge. Arlington, Va.: National School Public Relations Association, 1973.

Gamson, W. A. The Strategy of Social Protest. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1975, p. 6.

Getzels, J. W. and E. G. Guba. "School Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review, 65: 423-441, Winter, 1957.

Gezi, K. and R. D. Reyes. "Parent and Community Participation in Compensatory Education through District

Advisory Committees in California: A Progress Report," California State Department of Education, Sacramento. ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 062 467, 1971.

Gibson, J. L., J. M. Ivancevich and J. H. Donnelly, Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes. Dallas, Texas: Business Publications Inc., 1979, pp. 35; 138-139; 261.

Gittell, M. "Critique of the Citizen Participation Movement in Education," Journal of Education, 159: 7-22, February, 1977.

_____. "Decentralization and Citizen Participation in Education," Public Administration Review, 32: 670-686, October, 1972.

_____. Educating an Urban Population. California Sage Publications, 1967.

_____. Interview with Paul Godles, Office of Funded Programs E.S.E.A. Title IV-B Unit (Public), New York City Board of Education, March 24, 1982.

Good, C. V. (ed.). Dictionary of Education. Third Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973, p. 18.

Gordon, I. J. "Reaching the Child Through Parent Education: The Florida Approach," Gainsville, Florida: University of Florida Press, 1969.

_____. Parent Involvement in Compensatory Education. Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1970, p. 26.

_____. Interview with Andrew J. Grant, Grants Development Special State and Federal Programs, New York City Board of Education, March 22, 1982.

Green, P. and S. Levinson. Power and Community. New York: Random House, Inc., 1970.

Griffiths, D. E. Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959, p. 82.

Grotberg, E. H. "What Does Research Teach Us About Day Care?" Children Today, 1: 10, January-February, 1972.

Gustafson, L. and B. McConnell. Northern Cheyenne Follow Through Program, Serving Children on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation in Southeastern Montana," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 134 377, 1975.

Haas, E. J. and T. E. Drabek. Complex Organizations: A Sociological Perspective. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1973, pp. 8; 21-22.

Hagood, H. B. "Community Control of the Schools: A New Alternative," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 036 894, June, 1969, p. 6.

Hall, R. H. "Intra-Organizational Structural Variation: Application of the Bureaucratic Model," Administrative Science Quarterly, 7: 295-308, 1962.

Hamer, I., Jr. "Putting the Public Back into Public Education," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 139 791, May, 1977, p. 16.

Hamilton, M. K. "Decision Making Structure of a School System," Educational Leadership, 29: 668-671, May, 1972.

Handy, C. B. Understanding Organizations. New York: Penguin Books, 1978, p. 18.

Handy, M. R. What Happens in Management: Principles and Practices. New York: AMACOM, 1980, p. 117.

Harris, J. "Parent Trainer Volunteers and Tutors in Basic Skills for Adolescents in the Intermediate Schools." New York City Board of Education, Metro Center. Community School District 13, 16, 17, and 23, 1981.

Hart, L. B. Moving Up! Women and Leadership. New York: AMACOM, 1980.

Hastings, N. A. and J. M. Mello. Decision Networks. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978, p. 4.

Hess, L. P. "Partnership Program." California Unified School District, San Diego, California, 1981.

Hickman, C. "Volunteer Help: Resource in Instruction?" Educational Leadership, 30: 121-124, November, 1972.

Hicks, T. I., et al. "Effects of Parent Involvement in a

Prekindergarten Program on Children's Cognitive Performance." ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 176 888, August 1979.

Hogan, E. "Parent Power and Title I E.S.E.A.," National Urban League, New York: Education Division, 1971, pp. 1-21.

Hornbuckle, D. "Community School Action Centers." Dallas Independent School District, Dallas, Texas, 1981.

Howerton, E. "A Framework for School Board Decision-Making: An Analysis of the Process," Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1971.

Hrebiniak, L. G. Complex Organizations. St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1978, pp. 3; 9.

Hubbard, E. H. "Parent Education and Handicapped Children: The School as a Community Catalyst," Adult Leadership, 16-17: 45-46, June, 1967, p. 80.

_____. "Decentralization," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 046 070 Nov. 20, 1970.

Huck, S. W., W. H. Cormier, and W. G. Bounds. Reading Statistics and Research. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1974, pp. 68-72.

Hunt, J. M. "Parent and Child Centers - Their Basis in the Behavioral and Educational Sciences," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 41: 13-38, 1971.

Hunter, F. Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1953, pp. 7; 39; 113.

Iannaccone L. and F. W. Lutz. Politics, Power and Policy: The Governing of Local School Districts. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1970, p. 51.

Jobe, M. E. and M. Morton. "Joining Forces in Maryland: State and Local Councils," American Vocational Journal, 47: 75-76, December, 1972.

Johnson, M. and O. K. O'Fallon. "Clinch Powell Educational Cooperative Early Childhood Education Program. Evaluation Report," Tennessee University, Knoxville, ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 118 259, 1975.

Jordan, W. C. "How to Put Parents to Work in the Classroom," Nation's Schools, 81: 76-77, 1968.

Kansas Annual Evaluation Report. Title I E.S.E.A. Projects in Local Educational Agencies. "Programs for Neglected and Delinquent Children." ERIC DOCUMENT ED. 128 487, 1975.

Kelso, W. A. American Democratic Theory: Pluralism and its Critics. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1978, pp. 29; 234.

Kerlinger, F. N. "Progressivism and Traditionalism: Basic Factors of Educational Attitudes," Journal of Social Psychology, 48: 111-135, 1958.

_____. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973, pp. 471-473.

Knight, K. E. and R. R. McDaniel. Organizations: An Information Systems Perspective. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1979, pp. 5; 88.

Knezevich, S. J. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1969, pp. 31; 39; 69; 283.

Kornhauser, W. The Politics of Mass Society. Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1959, p. 236.

Kranz, H. The Participatory Bureaucracy, Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1976.

Kurfman, D. "Developing Decision-Making Skills," National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D. C.: 47th Yearbook, ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 139 720, 1977, p. 237.

_____. Interview with Fran Lapidus, Washington, D. C. Representative and Lobbyist for the New York City Board of Education, March 24, 1982.

Larson, C. J. and P. C. Washurn (eds.) Power, Participation, and Ideology: Readings in the Sociology of American Political Life. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1969, p. 1.

Lehman, R. A. and P. Ward. "Describing Decision Settings in Education," Educational Technology, 12: 43-45,

June, 1972.

Litchfield, E. H. "Notes on a General Theory of Administration," Administrative Science Quarterly, 1: 3-29, June, 1956.

Litterer, J. A. The Analysis of Organizations. New York: Johy Wiley and Sons, 1973, pp. 79-80.

Long, D. C. et al., "Legal Constraints on Decentralized Decision-Making in the Public School System of the District of Columbia," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 158 539, April, 1977, p. 3.

MacDonald, P. "Parents: A New Resource," Teaching Exceptional Children, 3: 8, 1971.

Malles, G. E. "Perceptions of Teachers, Administrators, and Community Council Members in Nine Select Elementary School Communities of the Chicago Public Schools as to the Role of the School-Community Council in Educational Decision Making," Dissertation Abstracts International, 35: 7566-7567, May-June, 1974-1975.

Mallory, B. L. and C. Cotton. "An Expanded Role for Public Schools: Community Based Delivery of Comprehensive Health and Mental Health Services," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 162 738, June, 1977, pp. 4; 13.

Manning, W. R. "Decentralization: Problems and Promises," NASSP BULLETIN, 53: 116-;23, October, 1969.

Maple, F. F. Shared Decision Making, Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1977, p. 8.

Martin, D. R. "The Role and Effectiveness of School Community Advisory Councils," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1974, p. 76.

May, L. J. "Community Involvement: The Detroit Experience," Community Education Journal, 4: 52-53, May-June, 1974.

Meisels, S. J., et al. "Project LINC: Learning In Integrated Classrooms," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 169 686, October 15, 1978.

Messer, J. "Project ACT or Accountability in Citizenship

Training," Duval County, Educational Services Division, Jacksonville, Florida, 1981.

Miles, M. B. "Educational Innovation: The Nature of the Problem," In M. B. Miles, (ed.), Innovation in Education. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1964.

Mills, C. W. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956, p. 167.

Mizell, M. H. "Maintaining Parent Interest in Title I Parent Advisory Councils," Washington, D. C.: Office of Education (DHEW), ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 166 340, January 30, 1979, p. 10.

_____. "Implementation of Title I Parent Advisory Councils in the Rural South," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED 186 166 1980, p. 1.

Morphet, E. L., R. L. Johns, and T. L. Reller. Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974, pp. 345-346.

McKee, J. B. Introduction to Sociology. Second Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974, p. 149.

McLaughlin, M., et al., "The Effects of Title I E.S.E.A. - An Exploratory Study," United States Education Resources Information Center, ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 073 216, April, 1971.

"Montana State Department of Public Instruction, Northern Cheyenne Follow-Through Project," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 190 287, 1980.

National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. "Special Report on Mandated Studies," Washington, D. C., 1979.

National Advisory Council on Indian Education. "Indian Education is 'Sui Generis': Of It's Own Kind," Washington, D. C.: Office of Education (DHEW), ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 182 077 June, 1979, p. 1.

Nebgen, M. K. "Parent Involvement in Title I Programs," The Educational Forum, 43: 165-173, January, 1979.

Nebraska Title I Evaluation. Nebraska State Department

of Education, Lincoln, ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 121 897, 1974.

"Nebraska State Department of Education Annual Evaluation Report," Lincoln, Nebraska: State Department of Education, ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 105 618, 1973.

New Jersey State Department of Education, Trenton. "Home-School Interaction: Project LEM." Hackensack Public Schools, New Jersey, ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 105 618, 1973.

New York City Board of Education Circular. Guidelines for Advisory Councils - Local (Community District) and Central. New York: The Board, 1971, pp. 1;2.

New York State Education Law, An Act to Amend the Education Law, The Education Law and Chapter 568 of the Laws of 1968 in Relation to Establishing a Community School District System in the City of New York. New York, 1969.

Nicholls, D. The Pluralist State. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975, pp. 114-118.

Nie, N. H., C. H. Hull, J. G. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner, and D. H. Bent. SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975, pp. 249-274.

Nolin, R. S. "Perceptions of Parents, Teachers, School Administrators and School Board Members with Regard to the Roles of the Elementary Schools," Dissertation Abstracts International. 39: 3357, 1978.

Novack, D. R. "Community Control: A Strategy for Change," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 120 293, August, 1975, p. 3.

Offenberg, R. M., et al. "Project PACT (Parent and Children Together): Evaluation of the Second Year." ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 183 763, December, 1979.

Office of Educational Information Services. Parent Associations and the Schools. New York: Hemisphere Press, Inc., 1971.

Office of Education, Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1972, pp. 259-260.

Office of Funded Programs. Advisory Councils: Partnerships That Work. Board of Education of the City of New York. Bureau of City-wide Advisory Council and Monitoring Task Force. New York: The Board, 1978.

Office of Funded Programs. A Compendium of E.S.E.A. Title I Programs 1967-1977; 1977-1978. Bureau of E.S.E.A. Title I Division of Community School District Affairs. New York City Board of Education. New York: The Board, 1978.

Office of Funded Programs. Guidelines for Advisory Councils. Policy Statement, Adopted by the Board of Education of the City of New York, New York: The Board, 1971, p. 2.

Office of Public Affairs. Parent Associations and the Schools. Policy Statement Adopted by the New York City Board of Education. New York: The Board, 1976.

Office of Reimbursable Programs. Board of Education of the City of New York. Memorandum 1122. SY 1976-1977, pp. 2; 32.

Orenstein, A. C. "Administrative/Community Organization of Metropolitan Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 54: 670, June, 1973.

Owens, R. G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970, pp. 50; 56;106-111.

Paffenroth, L. A. "The Relationship Between Expressed Values of Teachers and Principals, their Involvement in the Decision-Making Process and Their Attitudes Toward Education," Dissertation Abstracts International. 35: 2598, 1974.

Paine, F. T. and W. Naumes. Organizational Strategy and Policy: Text Cases and Incidents. Philadelphia, Pa.: W. B. Saunders Company, 1975, pp. 18-19.

Panek, A. "Volunteer Aides," Journal of Reading. 15: 523-525, April, 1972.

"Parent Advisory Council: Information Handbook for Title I in Georgia," Georgia State Department of Education, Atlanta, ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 153 122, 1977, pp. 10;11.

"Parents as Partners in Early Education: Saturday School," Ferguson-Florissant School District, Ferguson, Missouri, ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 100 513, 1973.

Parsons, T. and A. M. Henderson. Max Weber: The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Free Press, 1957.

Petosa, A. L., Jr. "The Role of Members of Permanent Citizens' Advisory Committees in the State of New Jersey," Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Fordham University, 1969.

Pharis, W. L. "Parents or Parrots," National Elementary Principal, 56: 78-80, March, 1977.

Pierce, L. C. "School Based Management," ERIC DOCUMENT ED. 188 320, June, 1980, p. 6.

Porter, L. L., E. E. Lawler, and J. R. Hackman. Behavior in Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.

Presidents' Manual for Parent Associations. New York: United Parents' Association of New York City, 1973.

Price, N. S. "School Community Councils and Advisory Boards: A Notebook for Administrators. Why? Who? What? When? How?" ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 115 583, July, 1977, pp. 23; 24.

Pugh, D. S., D. J. Jackson, C. R. Himings, and C. Turner. "Dimensions of Organization Structure." Administrative Science Quarterly, 13: 65-105, June, 1968.

Radford, N. J. Information Systems for Strategic Decisions. Reston, Va.: Reston Publishing Company, 1978, p. 75.

Ravitch, D., and W. R. Grant. "School Decentralization in New York City, 1975 and Detroit's Experience with School Decentralization," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 113 428, 1975, p. 1.

Reimann, B. C. "On the Dimensions of Bureaucratic Structure: An Empirical Reappraisal," Administrative Science Quarterly, 18: 462-476; 463, Sept. 18, 1973.

Riesman, D., et al. The Lonely Crowd. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950, pp. 206-224.

Reissman, L. "A Study of Role Conceptions in Bureaucracy," Social Forces, 27: -4, March, 1949.

Reyes, R. "The Role of School District Advisory Committees in the Educational Decision-Making Process of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I Programs for Disadvantaged Children in California," Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972.

Reyes, R., et al. "Handbook of California School District Advisory Committees, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 062 468, 1971.

Rice, W. "After the Music Program Went Flat, These Parents Orchestrated a Nonprofit Corporation to Restore Harmony," The American School Board Journal, 166: 40-41, December, 1979.

Riles, W. "Parents Advise on Policy," American Education, 4: 24-25, October, 1968.

Robinson, N. "Citizen Advisory Committees: The Faulty Lightning Rod in the Storm of School-Community Relations," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 165 247, June, 1978, p. 4.

Rose, A. M. The Power Structure: Political Process in American Society. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967, p. 6.

Rosener, J. B. "A Cafeteria of Techniques and Critiques," Public Management, 57: 16-19, 1975.

Rossi, P. H. "Community Decision Making:" Administrative Science Quarterly, March, 1957, p. 417.

Santostefano, S. and S. Stayton. "Training the Preschool Retarded Child in Focusing Attention: A Program for Parents," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 39: 732, 1967.

Sayler, M. L. "Parents: Active Partners in Education N.E.A. Center," Washington, D.C.: American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Educators, ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 059 823, 1971, p. 33.

Schultz, J. B. et al. "Quantity and Quality: Status of

Local Secondary Advisory Councils," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 185 331, 1980.

Sergiovanni, T. J. and F. D. Carver. The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1973, p. 177.

Seitz, S. T. Bureaucracy, Policy and the Public. St. Louis, Missouri: The C. V. Mosby Company, 1978, p. 10.

Shaw, M. E. Group Dynamics: The Psychology of Small Group Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971, p. 293.

Sherck, C. P. "Impact of the St. Louis Advisory Committees," American Vocational Journal, 47: 35; 33-35, April, 1972.

Sherif, M. An Outline of Social Psychology. New York: Harper, 1948, p. 101.

Simon, H. A. Administrative Behavior. New York: Macmillan, 1957, p. 220.

Simmonds, S. F. "Project Family Activities to Maintain Enrollment (FAME)." Baltimore Maryland City Public Schools. SY 1980-1981.

Sindledecker, C. "Volunteer Mothers Ease Teacher's Task," Educational Screen and Audio-Visual Guide, 49; 10, March, 1970.

Smith, M. L. "Prescription Learning Laboratory Program." Roosevelt School District No. 66, Phoenix, Arizona, 1981.

Steers, R. M. Organizational Effectiveness: A Behavioral View. Santa Monica, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing Company, 1977.

Stiles, R. L. "An Opinion Survey About the Tacoma Public Schools: Showing Relationships Between Educational Decision Maker Opinions, Community Opinions, and Community Opinions as Estimated by Educational Decision Makers," Dissertation Abstract International, 32: 4313, 1972.

Stonehill, R. M. and R. L. Fishbein. "Summarizing the Results of the Evaluation--The Comparability of Achievement Gains," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 185 104,

June, 1979, p. 3.

Stufflebeam, D. (ed.) Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971, p. 72.

Swingle, P. G. The Management of Power. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1976, p. 11.

Task Force 74. The Adolescent, Other Citizens, and Their High Schools: A Report to the Public and the Profession. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

The Education and Consolidation Act, 1981, pp. 115; 117.

The National Institute of Education. "Compensatory Education Study: A Final Report from the National Institute of Education," Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, September, 1978.

Thomas, J. "Lenox Early Childhood Outreach Program for Parents: An Evaluation Study. Final Report." District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C., ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 131 920, July 15, 1976.

Thomas, M. "Principals: Bring Em Back Alive," Nation's Schools, 91: 20, June, 1973.

_____. "Parental and Community Involvement: Rx for Better School Discipline," Phi Delta Kappan, 62: 203; 204, 1980.

Title I In Ohio. Tenth Annual Evaluation Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Ohio State Department of Education, Columbus. ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 121 893, Fiscal, 1975.

The 1978 Office of Funded Programs.

Title I In Ohio. Twelfth Annual Evaluation, Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Ohio State Department of Education, Columbus. ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 152 946, Fiscal, 1977.

Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Part A) PL 89-10, 1965. ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 062 468, 1971, p. 4.

Title I E.S.E.A.: How it Works - A Guide for Parents and Parent Advisory Councils. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1978, pp. 21; 60.

Tichenor, P. J., G. A. Donohue and C. A. Olien, Community Conflict and the Press. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1980, p. 7.

_____. Interviews with Carmela Tota, Director of the Chancellor's Monitoring Task Force for the Citywide Advisory Council of New York City, March 23, 1982 and March 25, 1982.

Travers, R. M. W. Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1973.

Turman, L., and B. Blatt. "Individualized Instruction Through Open Structure; a Child Centered School," Los Angeles Unified School District, California, ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 103 425, 1974.

Vallado, A. N. "Parent Involvement in Compensatory Education Through Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act Parent Advisory Committees in Selected School Districts in Texas," Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Houston, 1975.

Varney, S. "The Dynamics of Decision-Making of a School Board." Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Colorado State College, 1967.

Vidal, D. "The P.T.A. Is Not What It Was--Happily Some Say," The New York Times, December 12, 1976, p. 111.

_____. Interviews with Micaela Vilhotti, Bureau for Proposal Development, New York City Board of Education, March 23, 1982 and March 29, 1982.

Villars, G. K. "School-Community Interactions in Educational Decision Making: Perceptions of Educational Accountability in Colorado held by Members of School District Advisory Accountability Committees," Dissertation Abstracts International, 37: 1945, 1976.

Ward, P. Jr., and R. A. Lehman. "Describing Decision Settings in Education," Educational Technology, 12: 43-45, June, 1972.

Weiland, G. F., and R. A. Ullrich. Organizations: Behavior, Design and Change. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1976, p. 422.

Whetten, C. L. "An Assessment of Perceptions of School Principals, Community Council Chairpersons and Community Education Directors Concerning the Role of the School-Community Advisory Council in Educational Decision Making," Dissertations Abstracts International, 40: 1228-1229, September, 1979.

White, M. "Consultation with Parents." United Parents Association, 1968.

Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962, pp. 87-89.

Woodward, C. W. "Decision-Making and Problem-Solving in the Secondary School Principalship: Perceptions of Secondary School Principals and Significant Others," Dissertation Abstracts International, 38: 7076, 1977.

Zajano, N. C. and A. B. Davidson. "Burrillville School Department BRONCOS Reading Improvement Project," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 182 691, September 10, 1979.

Zeigler, L. H., L. C. Pierce, D. Sonnenfeld, R. Webb, and J. D. Grone. "The Responsiveness of Public Schools to their Clientele," ERIC DOCUMENT, ED. 127 699, June 1, 1973, p. 10.

Zey-Ferrell, M. Dimensions of Organizations: Environment, Context, Structure, Process and Performance, Santa Monica, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1979, p. 11.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS

PERSONAL DATA FACT SHEET

DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT

Please Indicate Appropriate Response:

1. Age: _____

2. Sex:

   Male: _____

   Female: _____

3. Years of Experience in Educational Decision-Making:

   Years: _____

PERSONAL DATA FACT SHEET

PRINCIPAL

Please Indicate Appropriate Response:

1. Age: _____

2. Sex:

   Male: _____

   Female: _____

3. Years of Experience in Educational Decision-Making:

   Years: _____

PERSONAL DATA FACT SHEET

TEACHER

Please Indicate Appropriate Response:

1. Age: _____

2. Sex:

   Male: _____

   Female: _____

3. Years of Experience in Educational Decision-Making:

   Years: _____

PERSONAL DATA FACT SHEET

DISTRICT PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBER

Please Indicate Appropriate Response:

1. Age: _____

2. Sex:

   Male: _____

   Female: _____

3. Years of Experience in Educational Decision-Making:

   Years: _____

PERSONAL DATA FACT SHEET

COMMUNITY SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRPERSON

Please Indicate Appropriate Response:

1. Age: _____

2. Sex:

   Male: _____

   Female: _____

3. Years of Experience in Educational Decision-Making:

   Years: _____

PERSONAL DATA FACT SHEET

PARENT

Please Indicate Appropriate Response:

1. Age: _____

2. Sex:

   Male: _____

   Female: _____

3. Years of Experience in Educational Decision-Making:

   Years: _____

HOJA DE DATOS PERSONALES

(PERSONAL DATA FACT SHEET)

PADRES

(PARENTS)

1. Edad: _____

2. Sexo: _____

3. Ãnos de Experiencia en Hacer Decisiones Educativas:

   Ãnos: _____

PERSONAL DATA FACT SHEET

COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD CHAIRPERSON

Please Indicate Appropriate Response:

1. Age: _____

2. Sex:

   Male: _____

   Female: _____

3. Years of Experience in Educational Decision-Making:

   Years: _____

DISTRICT PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL
PARTICIPATION RATING SCALE

This instrument is being sent with the approval of
Dr. Sayre Uhler, Mentor and Chairman, Division of
Administration, Policy and Urban Education,
New York

Michael R. Cioffi

DIRECTIONS TO RESPONDENTS

The following propositions are some of the major responsibilities of district parent advisory council members in selected decision-making activities of Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) programs and projects.

Please give ONE response for each statement.

On the right hand side of the page is a Degree of Participation Column. Read each item carefully. Please indicate your choice by circling the appropriate scale value dependent upon your knowledge and understanding of the functions of district parent advisory councils.

The seven potential statements are as follows:

1. Non-Involvement. The district parent advisory council does not participate in this activity.

2. Rubber Stamp. The district parent advisory council automatically accepts a decision concerning a Title I program or project by a district superintendent and/or community school board members.

3. Instituting. The district parent advisory council is responsible for initiating action concerning a Title I program or project.

4. Collaborating. The district parent advisory council is consulted by the district superintendent or community school board members prior to a final decision concerning a Title I program or project.

5. Advising. The district parent advisory council makes specific suggestions regarding a Title I program or project under deliberation.

6. Authorizing. The district parent advisory council must approve or "sign off" on Title I programs or projects before they are carried out.

7. Evaluating. The district parent advisory council evaluates the implementation of Title I programs and projects by the district superintendent.

8. Other Factors. Other factors are involved which are not included in the seven potential propositions.

DISTRICT PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL
PARTICIPATION RATING SCALE

1. Educational Needs Assessments:

	DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION							
	NON INVOLVEMENT	RUBBER STAMP	INSTITUTING	COLLABORATING	ADVISING	AUTHORIZING	EVALUATING	OTHER FACTORS
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. District parent advisory council members assist the district-unit level administrative personnel in conducting needs assessments surveys in the school district by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2. Council members work with community members in identifying community resources to enhance and enrich Title I programs and projects by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3. Council members utilize needs assessments inforamtion based upon standardized test scores by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4. Council members utilize needs assessments information based upon standardized test scores by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Educational Needs Assessments:

	DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION							
	NON INVOLVEMENT	RUBBER STAMP	INSTITUTING	COLLABORATING	ADVISING	AUTHORIZING	EVALUATING	OTHER FACTORS
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5. Council members utilize needs assessments information based upon community planning board data by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6. Council members utilize needs assessments information based upon district-unit level personnel findings and recommendations by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7. Council members utilize needs assessments information based upon school principal findings and recommendations by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8. Council members utilize needs assessments information based upon teacher findings and recommendations by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9. Council members utilize needs assessments information based upon New York City Board of Education statistical test data by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Project Selection:

	DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION							
	NON INVOLVEMENT	RUBBER STAMP	INSTITUTING	COLLABORATING	ADVISING	AUTHORIZING	EVALUATING	OTHER FACTORS
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
10. Council members engage in defining Title I project and program goals by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
11. Council members plan and provide for short-term project goals and objectives by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
12. Council members plan and provide for long-term project goals and objectives by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
13. Council members engage in developing Title I program and project designs by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
14. Council members help to approve Title I programs and projects by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Project Selection:

	DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION							
	NONINVOLVEMENT	RUBBER STAMPING	INSTITUTIONAL BORATING	COLLABORATING	ADVISING	AUTHORIZING	EVALUATING	OTHER FACTORS
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
15. Council members help select Title I remedial reading programs for Title I target youngsters by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
16. Council members help select Title I remedial math programs for Title I target youngsters by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
17. Council members help select Title I language arts programs for Title I target youngsters by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
18. Council members help select Title I Bilingual Pupil Services for Title I target youngsters by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
19. Council members meet with the district superintendent and community school board members in planning and providing for Title I compensatory education programs in the school district by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
20. Council members meet with school principals in planning and providing for Title I compensatory edu-	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Collaborative Planning:

	DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION							
	NON INVOLVEMENT	RUBBER STAMP	INSTITUTING	COLLABORATING	ADVISING	AUTHORIZING	EVALUATING	OTHER FACTORS
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
cation programs in the school district by								
21. Council members meet with teachers in planning and providing for Title I compensatory education programs in the school district by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
22. Council members work with parents of Title I pupils in planning and providing for Title I compensatory education programs in the school district by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
23. Council members work with community planning boards in planning and providing for Title I compensatory education programs in the school district by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
24. Council members work regularly with the district superintendent and community school board members in developing effective school-community public relations programs regarding Title I programs and projects by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Collaborative Planning

	DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION							
	NON INVOLVEMENT	RUBBER STAMP	INSTITUTING	COLLABORATING	ADVISING	AUTHORIZING	EVALUATING	OTHER FACTORS
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
25. Council members are provided by the district superintendent with orientation sessions in-service courses, workshops and/or other on-the-job training pertaining to Title I regulations, guidelines, and program information by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
26. Council members plan with the district superintendent and community school board members for the training of parent advisory council delegates and representatives by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
27. Council members assist the district-unit level administrative personnel in organizing educational conferences between parents and district level personnel by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
IV. Financial Management of Reimbursables								
28. Council members are involved in planning for the "carry-over" of Title I funds to maintain the same high quality service for the following school year by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Financial Management of Reimbursables

	DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION							
	NON INVOLVEMENT	RUBBER STAMP	INSTITUTING	COLLABORATING	ADVISING	AUTHORIZING	EVALUATING	OTHER FACTORS
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
29. Council members allocate budgets for the decentralized public school district's Elementary, Intermediate/Junior High Target Schools by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
30. Council members allocate budgets for the decentralized public school district's Optional Assignment Schools-Elementary, Intermediate School/Junior High School by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
31. Council members allocate budgets for Special Education and Special Schools by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
32. Council members allocate budgets for institutionalized youngsters by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
33. Council members allocate budgets for the Division of Educational Planning and supports Bilingual pupil services by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Financial Management of Reimbursables

		DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION							
		NON INVOLVEMENT	RUBBER STAMP	INSTITUTING	COLLABORATING	ADVISING	AUTHORIZING	EVALUATING	OTHER FACTORS
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
34.	Council members allocate budgets for the Division of Educational Planning and supports "Follow Through Program" by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
35.	Council members allocate budgets for the school district's "Impact Aid" (PL. 81-874) allocations by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
36	Council members allocate budgets for the distribution of non-public school Title I funds by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
V.	Program Evaluation and Implementation								
37.	The district superintendent offers council members guidance, support, and training in evaluation and implementation techniques by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
38.	The state-education department offers council members guidance, support, and training in evaluation and implementation techniques by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Program Evaluation and Implementation

		DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION							
		NON INVOLVEMENT	RUBBER STAMP	INSTITUTING	COLLABORATING	ADVISING	AUTHORIZING	EVALUATING	OTHER FACTORS
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
39.	The federal government (for example, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) offers council members guidance, support, and training in evaluation and implementation techniques by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
40.	Council members are involved in on-going auditing, monitoring, and evaluating current Title I programs and projects by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
41.	Council members participate in evaluating commercially prepared instructional materials for Title I programs by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
42.	Council members receive feedback from parents of Title I pupils regarding the effectiveness of Title I programs by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
43	Council member educational decisions in Title I programs are effective in improving pupil academic achievement by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Program Evaluation and Implementation

		DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION							
		NON INVOLVEMENT	RUBBER STAMP	INSTITUTING	COLLABORATING	ADVISING	AUTHORIZING	EVALUATING	OTHER FACTORS
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
44.	Council members' educational decisions in Title I programs are effective in improving pupil attitudes toward school by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
45.	Council members educational decisions in Title I programs are effective in improving the district parent advisory council members' self-esteem and self image by	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

DIRECCIONES A LOS PARTICIPANTES
(DIRECTIONS TO RESPONDENTS

Las siguientes proposiciones son algunas de las mayores responsabilidades para los miembros de los consejos consultivos de padres del distrito escolar (district parent advisory council members) en asuntos educativos (in the decision-making process) para programas y proyectos de Title I E.S.E.A. (1965).

Favor de dar UNA respuesta por cada declaración.

A la derecha de la página hay una columna titulada Grado de Participación. Lea cada declaración cuidadosamente. Favor de indicar su preferencia circulando la declaración apropiada o escala de clasificación (scale value) según su conocimiento de los deberes de consejos consultivos de padres del distrito escolar.

Las siete declaraciones posibles son las siguientes:

1. No participan. (Non-Involvement). El consejo consultivo de padres del distrito escolar no participa en esta actividad.

2. Funcionan como se les Mandan. (Functioning as a Rubber Stamp). El consejo consultivo de padres del distrito escolar acepta automaticamente una decisión educativa respecto a un programa o proyecto por el superintendente del distrito escolar o por miembros de la junta de educación de la comunidad (community school board members).

3. Empezar. (Instituting). El consejo consultivo de padres del distrito escolar, el superintendente del distrito escolar, o los miembros de la junta de educación de la comunidad son responsables de iniciar y comenzar acción respecto a programas o proyectos de Title I.

4. Colaborar. (Collaborating). El superintendente del distrito escolar o los miembros de la junta de educación de la comunidad consultan o conferencian con el consejo consultivo de padres del distrito escolar antes de hacer una decisión final respecto a un programa o proyecto de Title I.

5. Aconsejar. (Advising). El consejo consultivo de padres del distrito escolar hace sugerencias precisas (makes specific suggestions) respecto a

un programa o proyecto de Title I bajo discusión o deliberación. (under deliberation).

6. Autorizar. (Authorizing). El consejo consultivo de padres del distrito escolar debe confirmar o autorizar los programas o proyectos de Title I antes de que se lleven a cabo. (carry out).

7. Evaluar. (Evaluating). El consejo consultivo evalua, aprecia, o tasa (evaluates) los programas y proyectos puestos en práctica o cumplidos (implemented) por el superintendente del distrito escolar.

8. Otros Elementos. (Other Factors). Figuran otros elementos no incluidos en las siete declaraciones mencionadas anteriormente.

CONSEJO CONSULTIVO DE PADRES DEL DISTRITO
ESCOLAR ESCALA DE CLASIFICACION

DISTRICT PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL
PARTICIPATION RATING SCALE

I. Evaluación de Necesidades Educativas:
(Educational Needs Assessments)

	GRADO DE PARTICIPACIÓN (DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION)							
	NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONA COMO	SE LES MANDAN	EMPEZAR	COLABORAR	ACONSEJAR	AUTORIZAR	EVALUAR	OTROS ELEMENTOS
	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Miembros del consejo consultivo de padres del distrito ayudan a los administradores del distrito dirigir operaciones de necesidades educativas (needs assessments surveys) para el distrito escolar por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
2. Miembros del consejo consultivo trabajan con miembros de la comunidad en identificar recursos de la comunidad (community resources) para mejorar y enriquecer programas y proyectos de Title I (Title I programs and projects) por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8

Evaluación de Necesidades Educativas:

	GRADO DE PARTICIPATIÓN							
	NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONAMIENTO	SUELE MANDAN	EMPEZAR	COLABORAR	ACONSEJAR	AUTORIZAR	EVALUAR	OTROS ELEMENTOS
	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
3. Miembros del consejo consultivo ayudan a escoger aparatos y materiales de instrucción para programas y proyectos de Title I por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
4. Miembros del consejo consultivo usan información de necesidades educativas basadas en los resultados de exámenes de normas estandardizadas (standardized tests) por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
5. Miembros del consejo consultivo usan información de necesidades educativas basadas en los datos y hechos de la junta de la comunidad (community planning board) para proyectos y programas de Title I por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
6. Miembros del consejo consultivo usan información sobre necesidades educativas basadas en descubrimientos	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8

Evaluación de Necesidades Educativas:

	GRADO DE PARTICIPATIÓN							
	NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONAMIENTO CONSEJO	SELECCIÓN MIEMBROS CONSEJO	EMPEZAR	COLABORAR	ACONSEJAR	AUTORIZAR	EVALUAR	OTROS ELEMENTOS
	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
y recomendaciones de los administradores del distrito escolar por medio de:									
7. Miembros del consejo consultivo usan información de necesidades educativas basadas en descubrimientos y recomendaciones de los principales de escuela por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
8. Miembros del consejo consultivo usan información de necesidades educativas basadas en descubrimientos y recomendaciones de maestros por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
9. Miembros del consejo consultivo usan información de necesidades educativas basadas en datos estadísticos (statistical data) de Nueva York (N.Y.C. Board of Education) por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
II. Selección de Proyectos de Title I:									

(Project Selection)

	GRADO DE PARTICIPACIÓN							
	NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONA CON MOO	SESLEAS MANDAN	EMPEZAR	COLABORAR	ACONSEJAR	AUTORIZAR	EVALUAR	OTROS ELEMENTOS
	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
(Project Selection)									
10. Miembros del consejo consultivo ayudan a decidir metas y objetivos de proyectos y programas de Title I por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
11. Miembros del consejo consultivo planean metas y proyectos de programas de Title I a corto plazo (short-term) por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
12. Miembros del consejo consultivo planean metas y objetivos de programas de Title I a largo plazo (long-term) por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
13. Miembros del consejo consultivo hacen y desarrollan proyectos y programas de Title I por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
14. Miembros del consejo consultivo ayudan a confirmar o aprobar programas y proyectos de Title I por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8

Selección de Proyectos de Title I:

		GRADO DE PARTICIPACIÓN							
		NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONA COMO	SE LES MANDAN	EMPEZAR	COLABORAR	ACONSEJAR	AUTORIZAR	EVALUAR	OTROS ELEMENTOS
		1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
15.	Miembros del consejo consultivo ayudan a escoger programas de lectura "de refuerzo" (remedial reading programs) para niños privados de instrucción (educationally disadvantaged children) de Title I por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
16.	Miembros del consejo consultivo ayudan a escoger programas de matemáticas "de refuerzo" (remedial math programs) para niños privados de instrucción de Title I por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
17.	Miembros del consejo consultivo ayudan a escoger programas de lenguaje e idioma (language arts programs) para niños privados de instrucción de Title I por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
18.	Miembros del consejo consultivo ayudan a escoger servicios bilingües-biculturales (bilingual-	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8

Selección de Proyectos de Title I

	GRADO DE PARTICIPACIÓN							
	NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONA COMO	SESMANDAN	EMPEZAR	COLABORAR	ACONSEJAR	AUTORIZAR	EVALUAR	OTROS ELEMENTOS
	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
bicultural services) para niños privados de instrucción de Title I por medio de:									
III. <u>El Planear Juntos: (Collaborative Planning)</u>									
19. Miembros del consejo consultivo se reunen (meet) con el superintendente del distrito escolar y con miembros de la junta de educación de la comunidad (community school board members) para planear y proveer (provide for) programas de compensación en la educación (compensatory education programs) Title I en el distrito escolar por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
20. Miembros del consejo consultivo se reunen con principales para planear y proveer programas de compensación en la educación Title I en el distrito escolar por	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8

El Planear Juntos:

	GRADO DE PARTICIPACIÓN							
	NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONA COMO	SE LES MANDAN	EMPEZAR	COLABORAR	ACONSEJAR	AUTORIZAR	EVALUAR	OTROS ELEMENTOS
	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8

medio de:

21.	Miembros del consejo consultivo se reunen con maestros para planear y proveer programas de compensación en la educación Title I en el distrito escolar por medio de:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
22.	Miembros del consejo consultivo se reunen con los padres de hijos privados de instrucción de Title I para planear y proveer programas de compensación en la educación Title I en el distrito escolar por medio de:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
23.	Miembros del consejo consultivo se reunen con las juntas de la comunidad para proyectos (community planning boards) para planear y proveer programas de compensación en la educación Title I en el distrito escolar por medio de:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

El Planear Juntos:

	GRADO DE PARTICIPACIÓN							
	NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONA CON MO	SE LES MANDAN	EMPEZAR	COLABORAR	ACONSEJAR	AUTORIZAR	EVALUAR	OTROS ELEMENTOS
	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
24. Miembros del consejo consultivo se reunen regularmente con el superintendente del distrito escolar y con miembros de la junta de educación de la comunidad (community school board members) para planear y desarrollar programas eficaces (public relations programs) entre la escuela y la comunidad para dar mayor publicidad a programas y proyectos de Title I por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
25. Los miembros del consejo consultivo reciben talleres (workshops), sesiones de orientación (orientation sessions), cursos de servicio profesional (in-service courses), y otra instrucción por el superintendente del distrito escolar acerca del reglamento (regulations) e información de programas de Title I por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8

El Planear Juntos:

	GRADO DE PARTICIPACIÓN							
	NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONAN COMO	SE LES MANDAN	EMPEZARON	COLABORAR	ACONSEJAR	AUTORIZAR	EVALUAR	OTROS ELEMENTOS
	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
26. Miembros del consejo consultivo hacen planes con el superintendente del distrito escolar y con los miembros de la junta de educación de la comunidad (community school board members) para la instrucción de comisarios (delegates) y representantes del consejo consultivo del distrito de padres por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
27. Miembros del consejo consultivo ayudan a los administradores del distrito a organizar conferencias educativas entre padres de la comunidad y administradores del distrito escolar por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
IV. La Administración de Finanzas y de Fondos Federales: (Financial Management of Reimbursables)									
28. Miembros del consejo con-	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8

La Administración de Finanzas y de Fondos Federales:

	GRADO DE PARTICIPACIÓN							
NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONAN	SE LES MANDAN	EMPEZARÁ	COLABORARÁ	ACONSEJARÁ	AUTORIZARÁ	EVALUARÁ	OTROS ELEMENTOS
1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8

sultivo participan en la construcción de planes con la intención de transferir (carryover) fondos (funds) de Title I para que se mantengan los mismos servicios educativos de alta calidad para el próximo año escolar por medio de:

29. Miembros del consejo consultivo participan en la construcción de planes con la intención de obtener fondos (funds) para las escuelas públicas primarias y secondarias (I.S. and J.H.S.) de Title I por medio de: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

30. Miembros del consejo consultivo participan en la construcción de planes con la intención de obtener fondos para las escuelas de "Optional Assignment" del distrito por medio de: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

La Administración de Finanzas y de Fondos Federales:

		GRADO DE PARTICIPACIÓN							
		NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONAN CON MANDATO	SE LES MANDAN	EMPEZARÁ	COLABORARÁ	ACONSEJARÁ	AUTORIZARÁ	EVALUARÁ	OTROS ELEMENTOS
		1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
31.	Miembros del consejo consultivo participan en la construcción de planes con la intención de obtener fondos para la Educación Especial (Special Education) y las Escuelas Especiales (Special Schools) por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
32.	Miembros del consejo consultivo participan en la construcción de planes con la intención de obtener fondos para los Niños de Instituciones y Establecimientos Particulares (Institutionalized Youngsters) por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
33.	Miembros del consejo consultivo participan en la construcción de planes con la intención de obtener fondos para servicios de educación especial bilingüe-bicultural por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8

La Administración de Finanzas y de Fondos Federales:

	GRADO DE PARTICIPACIÓN							
	NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONAMIENTO	SUELDOS MANDADOS	EMPEZAR	COLABORAR	ACONSEJAR	AUTORIZAR	EVALUAR	OTROS ELEMENTOS
	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
34. Miembros del consejo consultivo participan en la construcción de planes con la intención de obtener fondos para el programa de educación especial llamado "Follow Through" por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
35. Miembros del consejo consultivo participan en la construcción de planes con la intención de obtener fondos para el programa de educación especial llamado "Impact Aid (PL. 81-874) Allocations" por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
36. Miembros del consejo consultivo participan en la construcción de planes acerca de la distribución de fondos federales de Title I para los padres que tienen hijos en escuelas privadas y religiosas (Title I), y no en las escuelas públicas de la ciudad de Nueva York por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8

Evaluación y Realización de Programas de Title I: (Program Evaluation and Implementation)

		GRADO DE PARTICIPACIÓN							
		NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONA COMO	SE LES MANDAN	EMPEZAR	COLABORAR	ACONSEJAR	AUTORIZAR	EVALUAR	OTROS ELEMENTOS
		1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
37.	El superintendente del distrito escolar ofrece a los miembros del consejo dirección (guidance) apoyo, e instrucción sobre métodos de evaluar y poner por obra (implement) los programas de Title I por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
38.	El departamento de instrucción del estado de Nueva York (N.Y.S. State Education Department) ofrece a los miembros del consejo dirección, apoyo, e instrucción sobre métodos de evaluar y poner por obra los programas de Title I por medio de:	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
39.	El gobierno federal, e.g. (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) ofrece a los miembros del consejo dirección, apoyo, e instrucción sobre métodos de	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8

Evaluación y Realización de Programas de Title I: (Program Evaluation and Implementation)

	GRADO DE PARTICIPACIÓN							
	NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONAN COMO	SE LES MANDAN	SEMPEZAR	COLABORAR	ACONSEJAR	AUTORIZAR	EVALUAR	OTROS ELEMENTOS
	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
	evaluar y poner por obra los programas de Title I por medio de:								
40.	Miembros del consejo consultivo participan en la intervención (auditing) en la inspección (monitoring) y en la evaluación de programas y proyectos actuales de Title I por medio de:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
41.	Miembros del consejo consultivo participan en la evaluación de materiales de instrucción para programas de Title I por medio de:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
42.	Miembros del consejo consultivo reciben informaciones (feedback) de padres de hijos privados de instrucción Title I en la comunidad acerca de la eficacia y del beneficio de	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Evaluación y Realización de Programas de Title I

	GRADO DE PARTICIPACIÓN							
NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONAN CONMO	SELES MANDAN	EMPEZAR	COLABORAR	ACONSEJAR	AUTORIZAR	EVALUAR	OTROS ELEMENTOS
	1 2		3	4	5	6	7	8

programas de Title I por medio de:

43. Decisiones educativas hechas por los miembros del consejo acerca de programas de Title I son ventajosas porque mejoran la realización (achievement) y progreso académico de los alumnos por medio de: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

44. Decisiones educativas hechas por los miembros del consejo acerca de programas de Title I son ventajosas porque mejoran los sentimientos y sensibilidades (attitudes) de los alumnos en cuanto a la escuela y la educación por medio de: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

45. Decisiones educativas hechas por los miembros del consejo acerca de programas de Title I son ventajosas porque elevan la dignidad (self-image) y el respeto de si mismo (self-esteem) de los 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Evaluación y Realización de Programas de Title I

	GRADO DE PARTICIPACIÓN							
NO PARTICIPAN	FUNCIONA COMO	SE LES MANDAN	EMPEZAR	COLABORAR	ACONSEJAR	AUTORIZAR	EVALUAR	OTROS ELEMENTOS
1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8

miembros del consejo consultivo de padres del distrito (district parent advisory council members) por medio de:

APPENDIX B

PANEL OF EXPERTS

PANEL OF EXPERTS

Dr. John D'Andrea	Chairperson Department of Modern Languages Bronx Community College of the City University of New York Bronx, New York
Don Davies	President Institute for Responsive Education Boston, Massachusetts
Dr. Mario Fantini	Dean of Education State University of New York New Paltz, New York
Dr. Daniel E. Griffiths	Dean of Education New York University New York, New York
Dr. Allan C. Ornstein	Department of Curriculum Instruction Loyola University Chicago, Illinois
Ms. Maria L. Pando	Elementary School Teacher of Bilingual Special Education New York City
Dr. David Seeley	Director Public Education Association New York, New York
Miriam Thompson	Parents League of New York Advocates for Children New York, New York

APPENDIX C

PANEL OF EXPERTS' EVALUATION FORMS

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Please respond to each item on the questionnaire and use this form to comment on the rating scale.

Directions:

1. Are the directions to respondents clear and concise?

   _____

2. Are the set of eight potential propositions suitable?

   1. _____
   2. _____
   3. _____
   4. _____
   5. _____
   6. _____
   7. _____
   8. _____

3. Are the instructions given for marking the questionnaire adequate and clear?

   _____

Item Analysis:

	Is the item properly classified under the correct activity or heading?			Is the item clearly expressed?	
	YES	NO	SHOULD BE	YES	NO AWKWARD AMBIGUOUS
I. Educational Needs Assessments:					
1. _____					

	Is the item properly classified under the correct activity or heading?			Is the item clearly expressed?		
	YES	NO	SHOULD BE	YES	NO	AWKWARD AMBIGUOUS
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						
11.						
12.						

II. Project Selection:

13.						
14.						
15.						
16.						
17.						
18.						
19.						
20.						
21.						

	Is the item properly classified under the correct activity or heading?			Is the item clearly expressed?		
	YES	NO	SHOULD BE	YES	NO	AWKWARD AMBIGUOUS
22.						
23.						
24.						

III. Collaborative Planning:

25. _____
26. _____
27. _____
28. _____
29. _____
30. _____
31. _____
32. _____
33. _____
34. _____
35. _____
36. _____

IV. Financial Management of Reimbursables:

37. _____
38. _____
39. _____
40. _____

	Is the item properly classified under the correct activity or heading?			Is the item clearly expressed?		
	YES	NO	SHOULD BE	YES	NO	AWKWARD AMBIGUOUS
41.						
42.						
43.						
44.						
45.						
46.						
47.						
48.						

V. Program Evaluation and Implementation:

49.						
50.						
51.						
52.						
53.						
54.						
55.						
56.						
57.						
58.						
59.						
60.						

VI. General Comments:

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

ALAN S. BLUMNER, PH.D.
ACTING DIRECTOR

RICHARD T. TURNER, PH.D.
ASST. ADMIN. DIRECTOR

July 16, 1979

Mr. Michael R. Cioffi
4461 Hill Avenue
Bronx, New York 10466

Dear Mr. Cioffi:

I am happy to inform you that your proposed study entitled, " The Participation of Parent Advisory Councils Perceived by School and Community Groups in New York City Public Schools", has been approved by the Office of Educational Evaluation with the following conditions:

1. Before involving any child in your study, you must obtain written parental consent. (I have enclosed a form which you may follow in drawing up your own Parental Permission Form.)

2. Your report of the study should not include identification of any school or school personnel. A code system should be used.

3. You must make it very clear to your prospective respondents that their cooperation is on a purely voluntary basis.

Whenever your report is ready, I would be interested in receiving a copy. Best wishes in this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Alan S. Blumner
Director (Acting)

ASB:bjs
enclosures

P.S. You may duplicate this letter in any quantity you need in order to inform cooperating principals and community superintendents that you have received approval from the Office of Educational Evaluation.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

RESEARCH APPLICATION

The applicant identified below has obtained preliminary clearance to conduct research in the N.Y.C. Public Schools and may now seek principals and community superintendents to cooperate in the study. However, before he may begin the actual study, the applicant must present cooperating personnel with a signed letter of approval which he will receive upon fulfillment of all necessary requirements, from the Director, Office of Educational Evaluation.

Michael R. Cioffi	4461 Hill Avenue, Bronx, NY	(212) 994-9466
Name of Applicant	Mailing Address	Telephone

University or Organization Affiliation: Fordham University, Lincoln Center

If investigator is a candidate for a degree, which degree? PhD

Is investigator a member of the N.Y.C. School System? Yes x No ___

Title of Study: "Professional and Lay Group Perceptions of Advisory Council Participation in Decision-Making in New York City Public Schools."

List tests, questionnaires, interview schedules and other evaluative instruments to be used. COPIES OF THESE INSTRUMENTS, A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT, AND A STEP-BY-STEP OUTLINE OF THE PROJECT MUST BE ADDED TO THIS APPLICATION WHEN IT IS PRESENTED TO PRINCIPALS AND COMMUNITY SUPERINTENDENTS.

--Instrument designed by researcher - "District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale," which measures the degree of advisory council participation in educational decision-making for Title I programs and projects.

Estimated duration of study: 1980-1982

Cooperating School	Grade	School Personnel No. of Classes	No. of Pupils	Signature of Principal

1. Selected elementary schools, intermediate schools and junior high schools in seven selected school districts in the Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn in New York City.

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE OF LETTERS

4461 Hill Avenue
Bronx, New York 10466
August 25, 1979

Dear Member of the Panel of Experts:

I am presently conducting research for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of Administration, Policy and Urban Education at Fordham University, Lincoln Center. The study has as its major focus the extent of the participation of district parent advisory councils in educational decision-making for Title I programs and projects in New York City public school.

An indispensable preliminary step in determining the extent of district advisory council participation in the decision-making process concerning Title I federally funded programs is to verify the content validity and reliability of each statement in the perceptionnaire. The mentor and dissertation committee have granted me permission to request your assistance in deciding the content validity and reliability of each item. Won't you please help in this research by judging the 45 statements according to the enclosed rating scale.

Your views are essential in this research and your participation is greatly appreciated. Your findings will enable me to proceed with the development and refinement of the research instrument as well as the gathering of statistical data. A summary of the results of this study will be forwarded to you upon request.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Michael R. Cioffi.

4461 Hill Avenue
Bronx, New York 10466
January 4, 1980

Dear Superintendent,

As chief educational leader for the school district, you have a close working relationship with the district-based parent advisory council. Parent advisory councils are an important component in the decision-making process for Title I federally funded projects and programs.

I am presently involved in research at Fordham University, Lincoln Center, where I am a doctoral candidate in the Division of Administration, Policy, and Urban Education. This research has as its objective the participation of parent advisory councils in educational decision-making as perceived by school and community groups in New York City public schools.

Your official position requires you to work closely with the district parent advisory council. As a result, I am taking this opportunity of forwarding you a copy of the perceptionnaire being used for my study. I seek your help and respectfully request that you answer each item and return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope at your earliest possible convenience. May I ask for your cooperation and assistance in completing the research instrument?

You may be assured that your views will be kept highly confidential. The code number on the return envelope is only utilized to check individual returns and to protect anonymity. The results of this study will be sent to you upon request.

Very truly yours,

Michael R. Cioffi

4461 Hill Avenue
Bronx, New York 10466
January 4, 1980

Dear Principal,

As an individual who is directly concerned with education in the City of New York, you are aware of the growing participation of parents in the decision-making process of Title I projects and programs.

I am presently involved in research at Fordham University, Lincoln Center, where I am a doctoral candidate in the Division of Administration, Polic Education. This research has as its objective the participation of parent advisory councils in educational decision-making as perceived by school and community groups in New York City public schools.

Your official position as chief educational leader of a Title I school requires you to work closely with the district-based parent advisory council. As a result, I am taking this opportunity of forwarding you a copy of the perceptionnaire being used for my study. I seek your help and respectfully request that you answer each item and return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope at your earliest possible convenience. May I ask for your cooperation and assistance in completing the research instrument?

I also believe that your leadership experience and keen insight into parental participation in educational decision-making for Title I projects and programs will provide responses that will be of great value to this study. Moreover, the success of this investigation depends upon your willingness to participate in it. Thank you for your assistance.

You may be assured that your views will be kept highly confidential. The code number on the return envelope is only utilized to check individual returns and to protect anonymity. The results of this study will be sent to you upon request.

Very truly yours,

Michael R. Cioffi

4461 Hill Avenue
Bronx, New York 10466
January 4, 1980

Dear Teacher,

As an individual who is directly concerned with education in the City of New York, you must be aware of the growing participation of parents in the decision-making process of Title I projects and programs.

I am presently involved in research at Fordham University, Lincoln Center, where I am a doctoral candidate in the Division of Administration, Policy, and Urban Education. This research has as its objective the participation of parent advisory councils in educational decision-making as perceived by school and community groups in New York City public schools.

As a representative of the teaching profession of a Title I school, you have worked closely with the school-based parent advisory council and as a consequence, have provided the district-based parent advisory council with important data which have had a significant impact upon educational decisions concerning Title I projects and programs. I am taking this opportunity of forwarding you a copy of the perceptionnaire being used for my study. I seek your help and respectfully request that you answer each item and return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience. May I ask for your cooperation and assistance in completing the research instrument?

I also believe that your years of experience and keen insight into parental participation in educational decision-making for Title I projects and programs will provide responses that will be of great value to this study. Moreover, the success of this investigation depends upon your willingness to participate in it. Thank you for your assistance.

You may be assured that your views will be kept highly confidential. The code number on the return envelope is only utilized to check individual returns and to protect anonymity. The results of this study will be sent to you upon request.

Very truly yours,

Michael R. Cioffi

4461 Hill Avenue
Bronx, New York 10466
January 4, 1980

Dear District Advisory Council Member,

Citizen and community-wide participation in the decision-making process of school affairs has greatly increased within recent years: Parents and other community members, like yourself, have manifested a sincere interest in education by serving as representatives of district-based parent advisory councils for New York City public schools.

I am presently involved in research at Fordham University, Lincoln Center, where I am a doctoral candidate in the Division of Administration, Policy, and Urban Education. This research has as its objective the participation of parent advisory councils in educational decision-making as perceived by school and community groups in New York City public schools.

Your official title places you in the unique position of providing your advisory council with expertise and imaginative leadership. As a result, I am taking this opportunity of forwarding you a copy of the perceptionnaire being used for my study. I seek your help and respectfully request that you answer each item and return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience. May I ask for your cooperation and assistance in completing the research instrument?

I also believe that your leadership experience and keen insight into parental participation in educational decision-making for Title I projects and programs will provide responses that will be of great value to this study. Moreover, the success of this investigation depends upon your willingness to participate in it. Thank you for your assistance.

You may be assured that your views will be kept highly confidential. The code number on the return envelope is only utilized to check individual returns and to protect anonymity. The results of this study will be sent to you upon request.

Very truly yours,

Michael R. Cioffi

4461 Hill Avenue
Bronx, New York 10466
January 4, 1980

Dear Community School Board Chairperson:

Citizen and community-wide participation in the decision-making process of school affairs has greatly increased within recent years. Parents and other community members, such as yourself, have manifested a sincere interest in education by serving as representatives of a community school board for New York City public schools.

I am presently involved in research at Fordham University, Lincoln Center, where I am a doctoral candidate in the Division of Administration, Policy, and Urban Education. This research has as its objective the participation of parent advisory councils in educational decision-making as perceived by school and community groups in New York City public schools.

Your official role places you in the unique position of providing your community school board with expertise and imaginative leadership. As a result, I am taking this opportunity of forwarding you a copy of the perceptionnaire being used for my study. I seek your help and respectfully request that you answer each item and return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope at your earliest possible convenience. May I ask for your cooperation and assistance in completing the research instrument?

I also believe that your leadership, experience, and keen insight into parental participation in educational decision-making for Title I projects and programs will provide responses that will be of great value to this study. Moreover, the success of this investigation depends upon your willingness to participate in it. Thank you for your assistance.

You may be assured that your views will be kept highly confidential. The code number on the return envelope is only utilized to check individual returns and to protect anonymity. The results of this study will be sent to you upon request.

Very truly yours,

Michael R. Cioffi

4461 Hill Avenue
Bronx, New York 10466
January 4, 1980

Dear Parent,

Citizen and community-wide participation in the decision-making process of school affairs has greatly increased within recent years. Parents and other community members, such as yourself, have manifested a sincere interest in education by serving as representatives of school-based, district-based, and city wide parent advisory councils for Title I projects and programs in the New York City public schools.

I am presently involved in research at Fordham University, Lincoln Center, where I am a doctoral candidate in the Division of Administration, Policy, and Urban Education. This research has as its objective the participation of parent advisory councils in educational decision-making as perceived by school and community groups in New York City public schools.

As a parent who has youngsters attending a Title I school in the City of New York, you must have many personal views concerning the extent of parental involvement in the decision-making process for Title I projects and programs. I am taking this opportunity of forwarding you a copy of the perceptionnaire being used for my study. I seek your help and respectfully request that you answer each item and return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope at your earliest possible convenience. May I ask for your cooperation and assistance in completing the research instrument?

I also believe that your awareness of the needs of your children and your personal views concerning parental participation in educational decision-making for Title I projects and programs will provide responses that will be of great value to this study. Moreover, the success of this investigation depends upon your willingness to participate in it. Thank you for your assistance.

You may be assured that your views will be kept highly confidential. The code number on the return envelope is only utilized to check individual returns and to protect anonymity. The results of this study will be sent to you upon request.

Very truly yours,

4461 Hill Avenue
Bronx, New York 10466
January 4, 1980

Estimados Padres:

La participatión de ciudadanos y miembros de la commidad en asuntos educativos (in the decision-making process) ha aumentado muchísimo en los últimos ãnos. Vds. han demostrado más interés en la instrucción sirviendo de representantes en los consejos consultivos de padres (parent advisory councils) de la escuela, del distrito escolar, y de la ciudad para proyectos y programas educativos de Title I (Title I projects and programs) en las escuelas públicas de la ciudad de Nueva York.

En la actualidad, me dedico a la investigación en la universidad de Fordham, Lincoln Center, donde presentaré la tesis de doctorado en la Division de Administration, Policy, and Urban Education. Esta investigación tiene como objetivo la participación de consejos consultivos de padres (parent advisory councils) en asuntos educativos (in the decision-making process) según grupos de la escuela y de la comunidad (school and community groups) de las escuelas públicas de la ciudad de Nueva York.

Como padres que tienen hijos en una escuela llamada Title I (Title I school) de la ciudad de Nueva York, Vds. deben de tener muchas opiniones personales acerca del punto de participación de padres en asuntos educativos (in the decision-making process) para proyectos y programas educativos de Title I (Title I projects and program). Quisiera aprovechar esta ocasión para enviarles una muestra del cuestionario que estoy empleando para esta investigación. Busco su ayuda y respetuosamente pido que Vds. respondan a cada declaración y que envíen el cuestionario por correo lo más pronto posible. Puedo contar con su cooperación y ayuda en completar el cuestionario o instrumento de investigatión?

Estoy profundamente convencido también de que su conocimiento de las necesidades académicas (academic needs) de sus niños, y de sus opiniones personales acerca de la participación de padres en asuntos educativos (in the decision-making process) para proyectos y programas de instrucción Title I (Title I projects and programs) ofrecerán respuestas importantísimas para esta investigación. Además, el éxito de mis esfuerzos depende de su verdadera participación. Muchísimas gracias por su ayuda.

Les puedo asegurar que sus respuestas o informaciones son confidenciales. El número que se utiliza en el sobre es para inspeccionar cuestionarios devueltos y para conservar su anonimidad (anonymity). Quisiera enviarles los resultados de esta investigación si Vds. lo desean.

Sinceramente,

Michael R. Cioffi

4461 Hill Avenue
Bronx, New York
January 4, 1980

Dear Chairperson of the Community Planning Board,

Citizen and community-wide participation in the decision-making process of school affairs has greatly increased within recent years. Parents and other community members, such as yourself, have manifested a sincere interest in education by serving as representative of a community planning board in the City of New York.

I am presently involved in research at Fordham University, Lincoln Center, where I am a doctoral candidate in the Division of Administration, Policy and Urban Education. This research has as its objective the participation of parent advisory councils in educational decision-making as perceived by school and community groups in New York City public schools.

Your official title as chairperson places you in the unique position of providing your community planning board with expertise and imaginative leadership. As a result, I am taking this opportunity of forwarding you a copy of the perceptionnaire being used for my study. I seek your help and respectfully request that you answer each item and return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope at your earliest possible convenience. May I ask for your cooperation and assistance in completing the research instrument?

I also believe that your leadership experience and keen insight into parental participation in educational decision-making for Title I projects and programs will provide responses that will be of great value to this study. Moreover, the success of this investigation depends upon your willingness to participate in it. Thank you for your assistance.

You may be assured that your views will be kept highly confidential. The code number on the return envelope is only utilized to check individual returns and to protect anonymity. The results of this study will be sent to you upon request.

Very truly yours,

Michael R. Cioffi

4461 Hill Avenue
Bronx, New York 10466
September 23, 1979

Dear _____:

Several weeks ago, I sent you a copy of my instrument entitled District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale as part of my doctoral dissertation at Fordham University, Lincoln Center. It is highly possible that the questionnaire never reached your address and as a consequence, I am enclosing another copy of the instrument which is vital to my study.

It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that you as a member of the panel of experts take a few moments of your time in deciding the content validity and reliability of each item, and return the completed Criteria for Evaluation of the Research Instrument to me at your earliest possible convenience. Your responses are crucial to my research and to the completion of my degree.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Michael R. Cioffi

4461 Hill Avenue
Bronx, New York 10466
March 4, 1980

Dear _____:

Several weeks ago, I mailed you a copy of my instrument entitled District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale as part of my doctoral dissertation at Fordham University, Lincoln Center. It is highly possible that the questionnaire never reached your address. As a result, I am enclosing another copy of the instrument for you to complete.

I am asking that you take a few moments of your time within your demanding schedule to complete this perceptionnaire and return it to me. Your perceptions with respect to the degree of participation of district parent advisory councils in Title I programs and projects are vital to the success of my investigation. Once again permit me to assure you that your responses will remain completely anonymous.

Thank you for your assistance and for your cooperation in the completion of this project.

Sincerely yours,

Michael R. Cioffi

APPENDIX E

TABLES

TABLE I

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITIES AND ITEMS CONCERNING THE DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION OF DISTRICT PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS OF TITLE I PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS

DPACPRS[a] ACTIVITIES ITEMS	STATEMENTS
I.	EDUCATIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENTS
1.	The assistance given by district parent advisory councils to district-unit personnel in conducting district needs assessments survey.
2.	The identification of community resources to enhance Title I programs by council members with community members at large.
3.	The selection by council members of instructional materials and equipment.
4.	The utilization by council members of standardized test scores for needs assessments.
5.	The utilization by council members of community planning board data for needs assessments.
6.	The utilization by council members of district personnel findings and recommendations for needs assessments.
7.	The utilization by council members of school principal findings and recommendations for needs assessments.
8.	The utilization by council members of teacher findings and recommendations for needs assessments.
9.	The utilization by council members of New York City Board of Education statistical test data for needs assessments.

TABLE I (continued)

ACTIVITIES ITEMS	STATEMENTS
II. PROJECT SELECTION	
10.	The participation by council members in defining Title I goals and objectives.
11.	The planning by council members for short term Title I goals and objectives.
12.	The planning by council members for long term Title I goals and objectives.
13.	The participation by council members in developing Title I program designs.
14.	The participation of council members in approving Title I programs.
15.	The selection by council members of Title I remedial reading programs for Title I youngsters.
16.	The selection by council members of Title I remedial math programs for Title I youngsters.
17.	The selection by council members of Title I language arts programs for Title I youngsters.
18.	The selection by council members of bilingual pupil services for Title I youngsters.
III. COLLABORATIVE PLANNING	
19.	The meeting of council members with the superintendent and school board members in planning for Title I compensatory education programs.
20.	The meeting of council members with school principals in planning for Title I compensatory education programs.
21.	The meeting of council members with teachers in planning for Title I compensatory education programs.

TABLE I (continued)

ACTIVITIES ITEMS	STATEMENTS
III. (continued)	
22.	The cooperation of council members with parents of Title I pupils in planning for Title I compensatory education programs.
23.	The cooperation of council members with community planning boards in planning for Title I compensatory education programs.
24.	The cooperation of council members with district superintendent and school board members in developing public relations programs from Title I projects.
25.	The provision by the district superintendent to council members of on-the-job training with regard to Title I program information and guidelines.
26.	The planning by council members with the district superintendent and school board members for the training of advisory council delegates.
27.	The assistance given by council members to district-unit personnel in organizing parent-district personnel educational conferences.
IV.	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OF REIMBURSABLES
28.	The participation of council members in the carry over of Title I funds.
29.	The allocation of budgets by council members for the school district's target schools.
30.	The allocation of budgets by council members for the school district's optional assignment schools.

TABLE I (continued)

IV. (continued)

31. The allocation of budgets by council members for special education and special schools.

32. The allocation of budgets by council members for institutionalized youngsters.

33. The allocation of budgets by council members for the Division of Educational Planning and bilingual pupil services.

34. The allocation of budgets by council members for the "Follow Through Program."

35. The allocation of budgets by council members for "Impact Aid" (PL. 81-874).

36. The allocation of budgets by council members for the distribution of non-public school Title I funds.

V. PROGRAM EVALUATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

37. The assistance given by the district superintendent to council members in evaluation and implementation techniques.

38. The assistance given by the state-education department to council members in evaluation and implementation techniques.

39. The assistance given by the federal government to council members in evaluation and implementation techniques.

40. The participation of council members in monitoring and evaluating Title I programs.

41. The participation of council members in evaluating commercially prepared instructional materials.

42. The presentation of "feedback" by parents of Title I pupils to council members regarding Title I programs.

TABLE I (continued)

V. (continued)

43. The effectiveness of educational decisions by council members in improving pupil academic achievement.

44. The effectiveness of educational decisions by council members in improving pupil attitudes toward school.

45. The effectiveness of educational decisions by council members in improving council member self-esteem and self image.

[a] Refers to the instrument entitled District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale, Appendix A.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTIONS OF RESPONSES OF EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONALS AND NON-PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL REGARDING THE DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION OF ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS OF TITLE I

ACT.[a] ITN.	GRP.[b]	1 N	1 %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	6 N	6 %	7 N	7 %	8 N	8 %	NR N	NR %	MEAN	S.D.
I. EDUCATIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENTS																					
1	EP[d]	12	17.6	9	13.2	4	5.9	22	32.4	16	23.5	0	0.0	1	1.5	1	1.5	3	4.4	3.39	1.54
	NPP[e]	8	13.3	8	13.3	1	1.7	14	23.3	15	25.0	1	1.7	4	6.7	1	1.7	8	13.4	3.76	1.77
	ALL	20	15.6	17	13.3	5	3.9	36	28.1	31	24.2	1	.8	5	3.9	2	1.6	11	8.6	3.56	1.65
2	EP	10	14.7	5	7.4	7	10.3	21	30.9	16	23.5	2	2.9	0	0.0	6	8.8	1	1.5	3.56	1.47
	NPP	9	15.0	4	6.7	7	11.7	14	23.3	12	20.0	1	1.7	2	3.3	5	8.3	6	10.0	3.55	1.63
	ALL	19	14.8	9	7.0	14	10.9	35	27.3	28	21.9	3	2.3	2	1.6	11	8.6	7	5.5	3.55	1.53
3	EP	20	29.4	14	20.6	2	2.9	14	20.6	11	16.2	2	2.9	1	1.5	3	4.4	1	1.5	2.88	1.71
	NPP	12	20.0	6	10.0	1	1.7	13	21.7	13	21.7	4	6.7	2	3.3	2	3.3	7	11.7	3.57	1.85
	ALL	32	25.0	20	15.6	3	2.3	27	21.1	24	18.8	6	4.7	3	2.3	5	3.9	8	6.3	3.18	1.80
4	EP	16	23.5	8	11.8	4	4.5	20	29.4	9	13.2	1	1.5	5	7.4	3	4.4	2	2.9	3.33	1.84
	NPP	13	21.7	3	5.0	1	1.7	18	30.0	11	18.3	2	3.3	3	5.0	2	3.3	7	11.7	3.57	1.82
	ALL	29	22.7	11	8.6	5	3.9	38	29.7	20	15.6	3	2.3	8	6.3	5	3.9	9	7.1	3.44	1.83
5	EP	22	32.4	8	11.8	4	5.9	19	27.9	6	8.8	0	0.0	3	4.4	4	5.9	2	2.9	2.85	1.74
	NPP	19	31.7	5	8.3	1	1.7	13	21.7	7	11.7	0	0.0	3	5.0	5	8.3	7	11.7	2.92	1.90
	ALL	41	32.0	13	10.2	5	3.9	32	25.0	13	10.2	0	0.0	6	4.7	9	7.0	9	7.1	2.88	1.81
6	EP	5	7.4	11	16.2	6	8.8	17	25.0	17	25.0	0	0.0	5	7.4	5	7.4	2	3.0	3.82	1.61
	NPP	9	15.0	8	13.3	2	3.3	16	26.7	15	25.0	1	1.7	3	5.0	0	0.0	6	10.0	3.65	1.71
	ALL	14	10.9	19	14.8	8	6.3	33	25.8	32	25.0	1	.8	8	6.3	5	3.9	8	6.3	3.74	1.65

TABLE II (continued)

ACT. ITM.	GRP.	1 N	1 %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	6 N	6 %	7 N	7 %	8 N	8 %	NR N	NR %	MEAN	S.D.
7	EP	5	7.4	8	11.8	5	7.4	26	38.2	14	20.6	0	0.0	6	8.8	2	2.9	2	3.0	3.94	1.54
	NPP	8	13.3	5	8.3	3	5.0	16	26.7	10	16.7	4	6.7	3	5.0	3	5.0	8	13.4	3.80	1.74
	ALL	13	10.2	13	10.2	8	6.3	42	32.8	24	18.8	4	3.1	9	7.0	5	3.9	10	7.9	3.88	1.63
8	EP	14	20.6	7	7.4	4	5.9	19	27.9	11	16.2	0	0.0	9	13.2	3	4.4	3	4.4	3.71	1.97
	NPP	10	16.7	1	1.7	4	6.7	17	28.3	11	18.3	2	3.3	3	5.0	4	6.7	8	13.4	3.75	1.73
	ALL	24	18.8	8	4.7	8	6.3	36	28.1	22	17.2	2	1.6	12	9.4	7	5.5	11	8.6	3.73	1.86
9	EP	12	17.6	15	22.1	4	5.9	13	19.1	11	16.2	1	1.5	5	7.4	5	7.4	2	3.0	3.31	1.84
	NPP	14	23.3	5	8.3	4	6.7	9	15.0	10	16.7	1	1.7	4	6.7	5	8.3	8	13.4	3.32	1.97
	All	26	20.3	20	15.6	8	6.3	22	17.2	21	16.4	2	1.6	9	7.0	10	7.8	10	7.9	3.31	1.89
EDUCATIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENTS																					
	EP	116	19.0	83	13.6	40	6.5	171	27.9	111	18.1	6	.98	35	5.7	32	5.2	18	2.9	3.42	1.73
	NPP	102	18.9	45	8.3	24	4.4	130	24.1	104	19.3	16	3.0	27	5.0	27	5.0	65	12.0	3.55	1.80
II PROJECT SELECTION																					
10	EP	10	14.7	3	4.4	6	8.8	20	29.4	17	25.0	3	4.4	2	2.9	5	7.4	2	3.0	3.79	1.59
	NPP	5	8.3	6	10.0	9	15.0	12	20.0	13	21.7	3	5.0	1	1.7	4	6.7	8	11.7	3.71	1.50
	ALL	15	11.7	9	7.0	15	11.7	32	25.0	30	23.4	6	4.7	3	2.3	9	7.0	10	7.1	3.75	1.55
11	EP	10	14.7	12	17.6	2	2.9	17	25.0	17	25.0	4	5.9	1	1.5	4	5.9	1	1.5	3.56	1.65
	NPP	10	16.7	7	11.7	7	11.7	14	23.3	9	15.0	1	1.7	3	5.0	3	5.0	6	10.0	3.39	1.71
	ALL	20	15.6	19	14.8	9	7.0	31	24.2	26	20.3	5	3.9	4	3.1	7	5.5	7	5.5	3.48	1.67
12	EP	8	11.8	8	11.8	4	5.9	19	27.9	23	33.8	3	4.4	0	0.0	2	2.9	1	1.5	3.77	1.48
	NPP	9	15.0	7	11.7	8	13.3	14	23.3	10	16.7	2	3.3	2	3.3	1	1.7	7	11.7	3.44	1.64
	ALL	17	13.3	15	11.7	12	9.4	33	25.8	33	25.8	5	3.9	2	1.6	3	2.3	8	6.3	3.62	1.55

TABLE II (continued)

ACT. ITM.	GRP.	1 N	1 %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	6 N	6 %	7 N	7 %	8 N	8 %	NR N	NR %	MEAN	S.D.
13	EP	5	7.4	12	17.6	7	10.3	17	25.0	19	27.9	3	4.4	2	2.9	2	2.9	1	1.5	3.77	1.51
	NPP	6	10.0	7	11.7	4	6.7	14	23.3	15	25.0	2	3.3	3	5.0	0	0.0	9	15.0	3.84	1.64
	ALL	11	8.6	19	14.8	11	8.6	31	24.2	34	26.6	5	3.9	5	3.9	2	1.6	10	7.8	3.23	1.56
14	EP	3	4.4	10	14.7	2	2.9	13	19.1	14	20.6	16	23.5	5	7.4	1	1.5	4	5.9	4.48	1.69
	NPP	4	6.7	6	10.0	5	8.3	11	18.3	17	28.3	4	6.7	3	5.0	2	3.3	8	13.4	4.10	1.59
	ALL	7	5.5	16	12.5	7	5.5	24	18.8	31	24.2	20	15.6	8	6.3	3	2.3	12	9.4	4.31	1.65
15	EP	16	23.5	13	19.1	3	4.4	14	20.6	11	16.2	4	5.9	3	4.4	2	2.9	2	2.9	3.24	1.85
	NPP	11	18.3	5	8.3	3	5.0	12	20.0	14	23.3	1	1.7	6	10.0	1	1.7	7	11.7	3.77	1.94
	ALL	27	21.1	18	14.1	6	4.7	26	20.3	25	19.5	5	3.9	9	7.0	3	2.3	9	7.1	3.47	1.90
16	EP	17	25.0	13	19.1	1	1.5	16	23.5	9	13.2	4	5.9	4	5.9	2	2.9	2	2.9	3.23	1.91
	NPP	14	23.0	4	6.7	4	6.7	13	21.7	8	13.3	2	3.3	4	6.7	4	6.7	7	11.7	3.39	1.93
	ALL	31	24.2	17	13.3	5	3.9	29	22.7	17	13.3	6	4.7	8	6.3	6	4.7	9	7.1	3.30	1.91
17	EP	19	27.9	12	17.6	1	1.5	13	19.1	11	16.2	3	4.4	4	5.9	4	5.9	1	1.5	3.16	1.94
	NPP	16	26.7	3	5.0	4	6.7	13	21.7	12	20.0	1	1.7	2	3.3	2	3.3	7	11.7	3.25	1.82
	ALL	35	27.3	15	11.7	5	3.9	26	20.3	23	18.0	4	3.1	6	4.7	6	4.7	8	6.3	3.20	1.88
18	EP	15	22.1	13	19.1	2	2.9	15	22.1	12	17.6	3	4.4	4	5.9	3	4.4	1	1.5	3.33	1.87
	NPP	16	26.7	4	6.7	4	6.7	13	21.7	10	16.7	1	1.7	3	5.0	1	1.7	8	13.4	3.24	1.87
	ALL	31	24.2	17	13.3	6	4.7	28	21.9	22	17.2	4	3.1	7	5.5	4	3.1	9	7.1	3.29	1.86
PROJECT SELECTION																					
	EP	103	16.8	96	15.7	28	4.6	114	23.5	133	21.7	43	7.0	25	4.5	25	4.1	15	2.5	3.59	1.76
	NPP	91	16.9	49	9.1	48	8.9	116	21.5	108	20.0	17	3.1	27	5.0	18	3.3	67	12.2	3.57	1.75

TABLE II (continued)

ACT. ITM.	GRP.	1 N	1 %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	6 N	6 %	7 N	7 %	8 N	8 %	NR N	NR %	MEAN	S.D.
III.	COLLABORATIVE PLANNING																				
19	EP	8	11.8	7	10.3	1	1.5	28	41.2	15	22.1	2	2.9	2	2.9	2	2.9	3	4.4	3.78	1.50
	NPP	7	11.7	7	11.7	5	8.3	18	30.0	11	18.3	1	1.7	1	1.7	2	3.3	8	13.3	3.52	1.49
	ALL	15	11.7	14	10.9	6	4.7	46	35.9	26	20.3	3	2.3	3	2.3	4	3.1	11	8.6	3.66	1.49
20	EP	6	8.8	6	8.8	0	0.0	32	47.1	19	27.9	0	0.0	1	1.5	2	2.9	2	2.9	3.88	1.29
	NPP	10	16.7	6	10.0	3	5.0	15	15.0	16	26.7	0	0.0	1	1.7	1	1.7	3	13.4	3.49	1.60
	ALL	16	12.5	12	9.4	3	2.3	47	36.7	35	27.3	0	0.0	2	1.6	3	2.3	5	7.8	3.70	1.44
21	EP	26	28.2	6	8.8	0	0.0	17	25.0	15	22.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	4.4	1	5.5	2.83	1.71
	NPP	13	21.7	4	6.7	5	8.3	11	18.3	13	21.7	2	3.3	0	0.0	4	6.7	8	13.4	3.27	1.69
	ALL	39	30.5	10	7.8	5	3.9	28	21.9	28	21.9	2	1.6	0	0.0	7	5.5	9	7.1	3.02	1.71
22	EP	14	20.6	6	8.8	4	5.9	20	29.4	19	27.9	1	1.5	0	0.0	3	4.4	1	1.5	3.42	1.57
	NPP	12	20.0	3	5.0	3	5.0	17	28.3	13	21.7	2	3.3	0	0.0	2	3.3	8	13.4	3.44	1.62
	ALL	26	20.3	9	7.0	7	5.5	37	28.9	32	25.0	3	3.0	0	0.0	5	3.9	9	7.1	3.43	1.59
23	EP	23	33.8	7	10.3	3	4.4	17	25.0	11	16.2	2	2.9	0	0.0	4	5.9	1	1.5	2.87	1.69
	NPP	22	36.7	3	5.0	2	3.3	11	18.3	8	13.3	2	3.3	3	5.0	1	1.7	8	13.4	2.96	2.00
	ALL	45	35.2	10	7.8	5	3.9	28	21.9	19	14.8	4	3.1	3	2.3	5	3.9	9	7.1	2.91	1.83
24	EP	8	11.8	6	8.8	3	4.4	22	32.4	15	21.1	1	1.5	4	5.9	7	10.3	2	2.9	3.83	1.62
	NPP	9	15.0	6	10.0	3	5.0	20	33.3	12	20.0	1	1.7	1	1.7	2	3.3	6	10.0	3.52	1.54
	ALL	17	13.3	12	9.4	6	4.7	42	32.8	27	21.1	2	1.6	5	3.9	9	7.0	8	6.3	3.68	1.58
25	EP	6	8.8	7	10.3	2	2.9	24	35.3	14	20.6	2	2.9	3	4.4	9	13.2	1	1.5	3.88	1.52
	NPP	8	13.3	4	6.7	5	8.3	16	26.7	10	16.7	3	5.0	2	3.3	5	8.3	7	11.7	3.69	1.65
	ALL	14	10.9	11	8.6	7	5.5	40	31.3	24	18.8	5	3.9	5	3.9	14	10.9	8	6.3	3.79	1.58

TABLE II (continued)

ACT. ITM.	GRP.	1 N	1 %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	6 N	6 %	7 N	7 %	8 N	8 %	NR N	NR %	MEAN	S.D.
26	EP	14	20.6	6	8.8	5	7.4	21	30.9	13	19.1	1	1.5	0	0.0	7	10.3	1	1.5	3.27	1.54
	NPP	11	18.3	6	10.0	4	6.7	14	23.3	14	23.3	3	5.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	7	11.7	3.51	1.69
	ALL	25	19.5	12	9.4	9	7.0	35	27.3	27	21.1	4	3.1	1	.8	7	5.5	8	6.3	3.38	1.61
27	EP	12	17.6	6	8.8	1	1.5	23	33.8	19	27.9	1	1.5	1	1.5	4	5.9	1	1.5	3.60	1.58
	NPP	13	21.7	2	3.3	3	5.0	16	26.7	11	18.3	3	5.0	4	6.7	1	1.7	7	11.7	3.67	1.89
	ALL	25	19.5	8	6.3	4	3.1	39	30.5	30	23.4	4	3.1	5	3.9	5	3.9	8	6.3	3.63	1.72
COLLABORATIVE PLANNING																					
	EP	117	19.1	57	9.3	19	3.1	204	33.3	140	22.9	10	1.6	11	1.8	41	6.7	13	2.1	3.48	1.60
	NPP	105	19.4	41	7.6	33	6.1	138	25.6	108	20.0	17	3.2	13	2.4	18	3.3	67	12.4	3.45	1.69
IV.	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OF REIMBURSABLES																				
28	EP	9	13.2	12	17.6	4	5.9	16	23.5	19	27.9	2	2.9	1	1.5	2	2.9	3	4.4	3.54	1.58
	NPP	10	16.7	7	11.7	5	8.3	11	18.3	13	21.7	3	5.0	0	0.0	2	3.3	9	15.0	3.39	1.64
	ALL	19	14.8	19	14.8	9	7.0	27	21.1	32	25.0	5	3.9	1	.8	4	3.1	12	9.4	3.47	1.60
29	EP	20	29.4	16	23.5	2	2.9	8	11.8	13	19.1	4	5.9	2	2.9	1	1.5	2	2.9	2.97	1.87
	NPP	16	26.7	7	11.7	3	5.0	11	18.3	10	16.7	3	5.0	2	3.3	1	1.7	7	11.7	3.17	1.88
	ALL	36	38.1	23	18.0	5	3.9	19	14.8	23	18.0	7	5.5	4	3.1	2	1.6	9	7.1	3.06	1.87
30	EP	19	27.9	18	26.5	2	2.9	8	11.8	10	14.7	3	4.4	2	2.9	4	5.9	2	2.9	2.82	1.81
	NPP	18	30.0	6	10.0	6	10.0	7	11.7	8	13.3	4	6.7	2	3.3	0	0.0	9	15.0	3.02	1.92
	ALL	37	28.9	24	18.8	8	6.3	15	11.7	18	14.1	7	5.5	4	3.1	4	3.1	11	8.6	2.91	1.85

TABLE II (continued)

ACT. ITM.	GRP.	1 N	1 %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	6 N	6 %	7 N	7 %	8 N	8 %	NR N	NR %	MEAN	S.D.
31	EP	23	33.8	14	20.6	0	0.0	8	11.8	7	10.3	3	4.4	4	5.9	5	7.4	4	5.9	2.78	1.99
	NPP	17	28.3	6	10.0	3	5.0	10	16.7	8	13.3	3	5.0	2	3.3	3	5.0	8	13.4	3.06	1.91
	ALL	40	31.3	20	15.6	3	2.3	18	14.1	15	11.7	6	4.7	6	4.7	8	6.3	12	9.4	2.91	1.95
32	EP	27	39.7	13	19.1	0	0.0	10	14.7	5	7.4	2	2.9	3	4.4	4	5.9	4	5.9	2.52	1.85
	NPP	18	30.0	6	10.0	1	1.7	10	16.7	11	18.3	1	1.7	1	1.7	3	5.0	9	15.0	2.94	1.83
	ALL	45	35.2	19	14.8	1	.8	20	15.6	16	12.5	3	2.3	4	3.1	7	5.5	13	10.2	2.70	1.85
33	EP	26	38.2	10	14.7	2	2.9	10	14.7	8	11.8	2	2.9	3	4.4	3	4.4	4	5.9	2.70	1.90
	NPP	18	30.0	7	11.7	1	1.7	16	26.7	8	13.3	1	1.7	2	3.3	1	1.7	6	10.0	3.00	1.80
	ALL	44	34.4	17	13.3	3	2.3	26	20.3	16	12.5	3	2.3	5	3.9	4	3.1	10	7.8	2.84	1.85
34	EP	28	41.2	14	20.6	0	0.0	5	7.4	5	7.4	2	2.9	5	7.4	4	5.9	5	7.4	2.51	2.01
	NPP	18	30.0	7	11.7	0	0.0	8	13.3	11	18.3	2	3.3	3	5.0	3	5.0	8	13.4	3.10	2.02
	ALL	46	35.9	21	16.4	0	0.0	13	10.2	16	12.5	4	3.1	8	6.3	7	5.5	13	10.2	2.78	2.03
35	EP	20	29.4	17	25.0	1	1.5	8	11.8	10	14.7	3	4.4	3	4.4	3	4.4	3	4.4	2.87	1.89
	NPP	16	26.7	5	8.3	3	5.0	10	16.7	14	23.3	1	1.7	1	1.7	2	3.3	8	13.4	3.16	1.80
	ALL	36	28.1	22	17.2	4	3.1	18	14.1	24	18.8	4	3.1	4	3.1	5	3.9	11	8.6	3.00	1.85
36	EP	22	32.4	15	22.1	1	1.5	11	16.2	8	11.8	3	4.4	3	4.4	3	4.4	2	2.9	2.83	1.88
	NPP	17	28.3	8	8.3	6	10.0	10	16.7	10	16.7	1	1.7	1	1.7	2	3.3	8	13.4	2.96	1.74
	ALL	39	30.5	23	15.6	7	5.5	21	16.4	18	14.1	4	3.1	4	3.1	5	3.9	10	7.8	2.88	1.81
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OF REIMBURSABLES																					
	EP	194	31.7	129	21.1	12	2.0	84	13.7	85	13.9	24	3.9	26	4.3	29	4.7	29	4.7	2.84	1.88
	NPP	148	27.4	56	10.4	28	5.2	93	17.2	93	17.2	19	3.5	14	2.6	17	3.2	72	13.3	3.09	1.83

TABLE II (continued)

ACT. ITM.	GRP.	1 N	1 %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	6 N	6 %	7 N	7 %	8 N	8 %	NR N	NR %	MEAN	S.D.
V. PROGRAM EVALUATION AND IMPLEMENTATION																					
37	EP	5	7.4	6	8.8	6	8.8	26	38.2	13	19.1	1	1.5	5	7.4	5	7.4	1	1.5	3.95	1.50
	NPP	8	13.3	7	11.7	3	5.0	16	26.7	11	18.3	3	5.0	3	5.0	1	1.7	8	13.4	3.71	1.72
	ALL	13	10.2	13	10.2	9	7.0	42	32.8	24	18.8	4	3.1	8	6.3	6	4.7	9	7.1	3.84	1.60
38	EP	18	26.5	5	7.4	4	5.9	18	26.5	9	13.2	1	1.5	3	4.4	9	13.2	1	1.5	3.17	1.81
	NPP	10	16.7	10	16.7	3	5.0	15	25.0	7	11.7	3	5.0	2	3.3	2	3.3	8	13.4	3.32	1.73
	ALL	28	21.9	15	11.7	7	5.5	33	25.8	16	12.5	4	3.1	5	3.9	11	8.6	9	7.1	3.24	1.77
39	EP	20	29.4	5	7.4	4	3.9	16	23.5	7	10.3	3	4.4	2	2.9	8	11.8	3	4.4	3.04	1.83
	NPP	16	26.7	3	5.0	5	8.3	13	21.7	7	11.7	4	6.7	1	1.7	2	3.3	9	15.0	3.16	1.82
	ALL	36	28.1	8	6.3	9	7.0	29	22.7	14	10.9	7	5.5	3	2.3	10	7.8	12	9.4	3.09	1.82
40	EP	13	19.1	9	13.2	2	2.9	18	26.5	10	14.7	1	1.5	10	14.7	1	1.5	4	5.9	3.73	2.03
	NPP	12	20.0	2	3.3	3	5.0	14	23.3	9	15.0	2	3.3	5	8.3	5	8.3	8	13.4	3.68	1.96
	ALL	25	19.5	11	8.6	5	3.9	32	25.0	19	14.8	3	2.3	15	11.7	6	4.7	12	9.4	3.71	1.99
41	EP	20	29.4	13	19.1	1	1.5	10	14.7	7	10.3	0	0.0	8	11.8	5	7.4	4	5.9	3.05	2.11
	NPP	17	28.3	4	6.7	2	3.3	10	16.7	6	10.0	5	10.0	3	5.0	3	5.0	9	15.0	3.29	2.08
	ALL	37	28.9	17	13.3	3	2.3	20	15.6	13	10.2	5	4.7	11	8.6	8	6.3	13	10.2	3.16	2.09
42	EP	7	10.3	8	11.8	2	2.8	25	36.8	8	11.8	2	2.9	5	7.4	8	11.8	3	4.4	3.80	1.67
	NPP	8	13.3	3	5.0	3	5.0	16	26.7	9	15.0	3	5.0	5	8.3	5	8.3	8	13.4	3.94	1.82
	ALL	15	11.7	11	8.6	5	3.9	41	32.0	17	13.3	5	3.9	10	7.8	13	10.2	11	8.6	3.86	1.73

TABLE II (continued)

ACT. ITM.	GRP.	1 N	1 %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	6 N	6 %	7 N	7 %	8 N	8 %	NR N	NR %	MEAN	S.D.
43	EP	13	19.1	6	8.8	2	2.9	15	22.1	13	19.1	4	5.9	8	11.8	4	5.9	3	4.4	3.87	2.01
	NPP	10	16.7	1	1.7	6	10.0	13	21.7	11	18.3	3	5.0	4	6.7	4	6.7	8	13.4	3.81	1.83
	ALL	23	18.0	7	5.5	8	6.3	28	21.9	24	18.8	7	5.5	12	9.4	8	6.3	11	8.6	3.84	1.93
44	EP	14	20.6	9	13.2	1	1.5	17	25.0	10	14.7	2	2.9	7	10.3	5	7.4	3	4.4	3.57	1.99
	NPP	9	15.0	2	3.3	2	3.3	13	21.7	13	21.7	1	1.7	5	8.3	6	10.0	9	15.0	3.93	1.86
	ALL	23	18.0	11	8.6	3	2.3	30	23.4	23	18.0	3	2.3	12	9.4	11	8.6	12	9.4	3.72	1.93
45	EP	6	8.8	9	13.2	1	1.5	21	30.9	15	22.1	2	2.9	4	5.9	7	10.3	3	4.4	3.90	1.62
	NPP	7	11.7	5	8.3	1	1.7	16	26.7	11	18.3	2	3.3	3	5.0	6	10.0	9	15.0	3.82	1.71
	ALL	13	10.2	14	10.9	2	1.6	37	28.9	26	20.3	4	3.1	7	5.5	13	10.2	12	9.4	3.86	1.65
PROGRAM EVALUATION AND IMPLEMENTATION																					
	EP	116	19.0	70	11.4	23	3.8	166	27.1	92	15.0	16	2.6	52	8.5	52	8.5	25	4.1	3.57	1.87
	NPP	97	18.0	37	6.9	28	5.2	126	23.3	84	15.6	27	5.0	31	5.7	34	6.3	76	14.1	3.62	1.84

[a] Refer to Table I for identification of activities and items.

[b] The statements of items one to 45 were scored on a one to seven value scale where a value of 1 = non-involvement, 2 = rubber stamp, 3 = instituting, 4 = collaborating, 5 = advising, 6 = authorizing, and 7 = evaluating. Responses of eight (other factors) were not included in the calculations since 'other factors' indicated that something other than involvement was being rated. NR = No Response.

[c] The symbol, %, referred to the percentage of relative frequency.

TABLE II (continued)

[d] The symbol, EP, referred to educational professionals which included the district community superintendents, principals of Title I schools, and teachers of Title I pupils who took part in this study.

[e] The symbol, NPP, referred to non-professional personnel or non-professionals which included district parent advisory council members, parents of Title I pupils, community school board chairpersons, and chairpersons of community planning boards who took part in this study.

TABLE III

THE t TESTS OF THE DIFFERENCES OF THE MEANS BETWEEN PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COUNCILS IN FIVE DECISION-MAKING ACTIVITIES

DECISION-MAKING ACTIVITIES [a]	df [b]	t value [c]
EDUCATIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENTS	126	.75
PROJECT SELECTION	126	1.21
COLLABORATIVE PLANNING	126	1.05
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OF REIMBURSABLES	126	.02
PROGRAM EVALUATION AND IMPLEMENTATION	126	.85

[a] Refer to Table I for identification of decision-making activities.

[b] The symbol, df, referred to the degrees of freedom.

[c] The means and standard deviations for each of the five decision-making activities are found in Table II.

[d] The statements of items one to 45 were scored on a one to seven value scale, where a value of 1 = no involvement, 2 = rubber stamp, 3 = instituting, 4 = collaborating, 5 = advising, 6 = authorizing, 7 = evaluating.

TABLE III (continued)

Responses of 8, 'other factors,' indicated that something other than participation was being rated.

[e] There were 68 educational professionals and 60 non-professional personnel members involved in this study.

*p < .05
**p < .01

TABLE IV

COMPARISONS AMONG RATING SCALE DIMENSIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONALS AND NON-PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

Group	[a] N	[b] MS Subjects	df	[b] MS [c] Activities	[b] MS Residual	F	Significant Groups
EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONALS	68	497.840	4,268	475.294	60.982	7.794**	4 < 1,2,3,5
NON-PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL	60	895.563	4,236	136.395	54.037	2.524*	4 < 2

[a] N = educational professionals and non-professional personnel involved in the study.

[b] The sources of the Means for these analyses were obtained from the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale.

[c] The five major decision-making activities in this study were as follows: Educational Needs Assessments; Project Selection; Collaborative Planning; Financial Management of Reimbursables; and Project Evaluation and Implementation.

The statements of items one to 45 were scored on a one to seven value scale, where a value of 1 = non-involvement, 2 = rubber stamp, 3 = instituting, 4 = collaborating, 5 = advising, 6 = authorizing, and 7 = evaluating. Responses of 8, 'other factors,' were not included in the calculations since 'other factors' indicated that something other than participation was being rated.

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE V

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONALS REGARDING PARTICIPATION OF COUNCIL MEMBERS IN TITLE I AND AGE, SEX, AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATIONAL DECISION-MAKING

DECISION MAKING ACTIVITIES[a]	VARIABLES[b] AGE	SEX[c]	YEARS OF DECISION-MAKING EXPERIENCE
EDUCATIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENTS	.128	.108	.130
PROJECT SELECTION	-.062	-.031	-.039
COLLABORATIVE PLANNING	.058	-.027	-.007
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OF REIMBURSABLES	-.144	-.049	.026
PROGRAM EVALUATION AND IMPLEMENTATION	.013	-.102	.199

[a] The major decision-making activities in this study were Educational Needs Assessments, Project Selection, Collaborative Planning, Financial Management of Reimbursables, and Program Evaluation and Implementation. The statements of items one to 45 were scored on a one to seven value scale, where a value of 1 = non-involvement, 2 = rubber stamp, 3 = instituting, 4 = collaborating, 5 = advising, 6 = authorizing, and 7 = evaluating. Responses of 8, 'other factors,' were not included in the calculations since 'other factors' indicated that something other than participation was being rated.

[b] The demographic variables in this study were age, sex and years of experience in educational decision-making.

[c] Sex was coded as follows: Males = 1, Females = 2.

*p < .05
**p < .01

TABLE VI

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN NON-PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL REGARDING PARTICIPATION OF COUNCIL MEMBERS IN TITLE I AND AGE, SEX, AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATIONAL DECISION-MAKING

DECISION MAKING ACTIVITIES[a]	VARIABLES[b] AGE	SEX[c]	YEARS OF DECISION-MAKING EXPERIENCE
EDUCATIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENTS	.123	-.073	-.067
PROJECT SELECTION	.057	.056	-.193
COLLABORATIVE PLANNING	.153	.091	-.237
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OF REIMBURSABLES	-.003	.276	-.153
PROGRAM EVALUATION AND IMPLEMENTATION	.181	.077	-.037

[a] The major decision-making activities in this study were Educational Needs Assessments, Project Selection, Collaborative Planning, Financial Management of Reimbursables, and Program Evaluation and Implementation. The statements of items one to 45 were scored on a one to seven value scale, where a value of 1 = non-involvement, 2 = rubber stamp, 3 = instituting, 4 = collaborating, 5 = advising, 6 = authorizing, and 7 = evaluating. Responses of 8, 'other factors,' were not included in the calculations since 'other factors' indicated that something other than participation was being rated.

[b] The demographic variables in this study were age, sex and years of experience in educational decision-making.

[c] Sex was coded as follows: Males = 1, Females = 2.

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$

PROFESSIONAL AND LAY GROUP PERCEPTIONS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING IN NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Michael Raymond Cioffi, PhD
Fordham University, 1982

Mentor: Sayre Uhler, EdD

The purpose of this investigation was to determine and compare the degree of participation in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects relative to five decision-making activities: (1) educational needs assessments; (2) project selection; (3) collaborative planning; (4) financial management of reimbursables; and (5) program evaluation and implementation as perceived by educational professionals such as district superintendents, principals of Title I schools, and teachers of Title I pupils, in comparison with non-professional personnel such as district parent advisory council members, community school board chairpersons, parents of Title I pupils, and chairpersons of community planning boards in selected New York City elementary schools, intermediate schools, and junior high schools.

Moreover, this study sought to determine relationships between the perceptions of educational professionals in comparison with non-professional personnel with regard

to the degree of participation of council members in the decision-making process of Title I E.S.E.A. (1965) programs and projects, and the variables of age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making.

The subjects of this investigation consisted of a total of 128 respondents including educational professionals and non-professional personnel selected from seven school districts located in the Boroughs of the Bronx and Brooklyn in New York City. The principal instrument utilized for this study was the District Parent Advisory Council Participation Rating Scale designed by the researcher.

The major conclusions based on the findings of this investigation were as follows:

1. Financial management of reimbursables was rated significantly lower with respect to advisory council decision-making activity by both educational professionals and non-professionals.

2. No significant differences were found between the perceived degree of participation for educational professionals and non-professional personnel in the five decision-making activities.

3. There were no significant correlations between the variables of age, sex, and years of experience in educational decision-making and perceptions of the degree of participation of district parent advisory council members in the decision-making process of Title I programs and projects relative to the five decision-making activities.

VITA

Name	Michael R. Cioffi
Date of Birth	October 7, 1925
Place of Birth	Bronx, New York
High School	Evander Childs High School
Graduated	June, 1942
College	Brooklyn College, Brooklyn New York, New York
Degree	Bachelor of Arts
Conferred	June, 1947
University	New York University New York, New York
Degree	Master of Arts
Conferred	June, 1949
Diploma	Professional Diploma
Conferred	June, 1958